EARLY·CHURCH CLASSICS

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

F08.11
R118


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/epistletodiognet0000revl_x4q3

THE EPISTLE
TO
DIOGNETUS

Anon

Early Church Classics

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

BY THE

REV. L. B. RADFORD, M.A.

RECTOR OF HOLT (DIO. NORWICH)
SOMETIME FELLOW OF S. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE



LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET
NEW YORK: E. S. GORHAM
1908

16023

[PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.]

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION:

I. HISTORY OF THE TEXT 7

II. DATE AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE . 10

III. AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE . . . 21

IV. THE INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE: CHAPTERS XI AND XII 31

V. THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE . . 38

VI. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE . . . 43

VII. SOME CRITICISMS OF THE EPISTLE . . 45

TRANSLATION AND NOTES 52

INDEX 91

THE

EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

INTRODUCTION

I. HISTORY OF THE TEXT

THE story of the *Epistle to Diognetus* is one of the most romantic episodes in the history of literature. It is the story of a solitary mediæval manuscript discovered in the sixteenth century and destroyed in the nineteenth. During the disturbances of the French Revolution (1793-95) there came into the municipal library at Strassburg a codex of 260 pages containing amongst other writings a number of treatises assigned by their titles to Justin, the philosopher and martyr (d. 163), viz. 1. "On the monarchia" (of God); 2. "An exhortation to the Greeks"; 3. "An exposition of the faith concerning the right confession, or concerning the Trinity"; 4. "To the Greeks"; 5. "To Diognetus." Among the writings that followed

the *Epistle to Diognetus* were the *Petition of Athenagoras on behalf of the Christians* (c. 177), and his treatise *On the Resurrection*. The rest of the contents of the MS. were in a later hand, but the style of the earlier hand pointed to the thirteenth or fourteenth century as the date of the writing of the MS. A note on the back of the codex, in the handwriting of Reuchlin, the famous scholar of Pforzheim (d. 1522), stated that the manuscript was once in his possession, and had been bought by him from the Carthusian brotherhood in his native town. About 1560 it was in the monastic library of Maursmünster in Alsace. In 1586 a transcript was made by the scholar-printer, H. Stephanus of Paris, and another transcript was made soon afterwards by J. Beurer, a professor at Freiburg ; and the variations in Beurer's copy were embodied by Stephanus in the appendix to the edition of the Epistle which he published in 1592, and again by F. Sylburg of Heidelberg in the notes of his edition of Justin's works in 1593.[1] The text of Stephanus' edition was adopted in the editions of Prudentius of S. Maur (Paris, 1742), of Gallandi (Venice, 1765), and of Oberthür (Wurzburg, 1777), and formed the basis of the critical editions of

[1] For the history of the MS. see Otto, *Corp. Apol. Chr.*, vol. iii. ; *Just. Op.* ii., pp. xiii.–xx. ; Gebhardt, *Patr. Apost. Op.* I. 2, pp. 142–6 ; Kihn, *Der Ursprung des Briefes an Diognet*, p. 34 foll.

Böhl (Berlin, 1826) and Hefele (Tübingen, 1839). At last the Strassburg MS. (*Codex Argentoratensis Græc.* ix, so called from the old Latin name of the city, Argentoratum), with its edges gnawed by mice and otherwise injured by damp and rough usage, was carefully examined by Ed. Cunitz in 1842 for Otto's edition of the Epistle (1843, 1849, 1852), and again by Ed. Reuss in 1861 for Otto's third edition of Justin's works (Jena, 1879). It was fortunate, indeed, that its evidence on points of textual criticism was thus recorded; for nine years later the codex itself perished in the flames when the Alsatian city-fortress was bombarded by the Prussian forces (Aug. 24, 1870). Beurer's transcript had long been lost; only the transcript of Stephanus now remained, in the University of Leyden, where it is still preserved (*Codex Græc. Voss.*, Q. 30). Ten years later (1880) it lost its pride of place, for Dr. Neumann of Halle discovered in the University library at Tübingen a yet earlier transcript made by Bernard Haus in 1580 for the Tübingen professor, Martin Crusius (*Codex Misc. Tübing.*, M. b. 17). The text of the Epistle has now probably reached its final form. Many of the brilliant emendations made by Lachmann and Bunsen in Bunsen's *Analecta Antenicæna* (Lond., 1854, i. 103–121) have found permanent acceptance. Gebhardt provided a complete *apparatus criticus* in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers (*Patr. Apost.*

Opera, I. 2, ed. 1878). Otto's last edition of the *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum* (*Justini Opera*, t. ii. 1879) contains an exhaustive preface on the history of the text; and now Funk's *Apostolischen Väter* (1901) has given us at last a text which is the first to embody the results of a careful study of the Tübingen transcript of 1580. It is this text which has been used in the present work.

II. DATE AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE

THE lost *Codex Argentoratensis* was the only evidence for the existence of the *Epistle to Diognetus*. Nowhere in all Christian literature is there a reference to the letter or to its author. Our knowledge of its date, its authorship, its destination, depends entirely upon its own contents; and the few indications found there are as inconclusive as they are suggestive.

Dr. Donaldson,[1] perplexed by the apparent mystery of the relation of Stephanus' text to the *Codex Argentoratensis*, and hesitating to accuse the editor of forgery, was "inclined to think it more likely that some of the Greeks who came over to Italy when threatened by the Turks may have written the treatise, not so much from a wish to

[1] *Crit. Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctr.* (1866), i. 141, 142.

counterfeit a work of Justin as to write a good declamation in the old style." But he added, "There is no sound basis for any theory with regard to this remarkable production." Dräseke[1] devoted a quite unnecessary amount of learned criticism to the demolition of Donaldson's arguments against the antiquity of the Epistle. The handwriting of the codex, in the opinion of experts, places it conclusively long before the Renaissance. Harnack[2] shows good reason for thinking that the codex can be traced back to an earlier text of the seventh century.

Overbeck[3] maintained that the language of the Epistle with reference alike to paganism, to Judaism and to Christianity was so foreign to the character of early apologetic literature that the Epistle must be regarded as having been written after the age of Constantine, probably in the fourth century. There is, he pointed out, no reference in the Epistle to the argument from prophecy. There is little direct quotation from Holy Scripture, and yet the language is interwoven with silent reminiscences of the New Testament, especially of S. Paul and S. John. Paganism is dismissed with a contemptuous exposure of popular idolatry; Greek philosophy is rejected as destitute of truth. The divine character

[1] *Der Brief an Diognetos* (Leipzig, 1881), pp. 2–7.
[2] *Texte. u. Untersuch.* I. 1, pp. 79 foll., 85, 162 foll.
[3] *Studien zur Gesch. d. alten Kirche* (1875), i. 1–92.

of Judaism as a preparatory revelation is ignored in the assertion of the uniqueness of the revelation of God in Christ.[1] Some of these objections of Overbeck will be treated more fully elsewhere. It is sufficient here to remark that at all these points where Overbeck lays stress upon the divergence of the Epistle from the tone and contents of the Apologies of Justin, Tatian and Clement, a parallel has been found in the *Apology of Aristides*, an undeniable work of the second century, the discovery of which has in fact necessitated a revision of the general conception of early Christian apologetics. Later critics are almost as unanimous in rejecting Overbeck's theory as in rejecting Donaldson's, though Overbeck had much more to say for himself, and raised questions which have borne rich fruit in discussion.

The writer of an ambitious article in the *Church Quarterly Review* of April 1877, on the strength of "a vast number of coincidences in thought and language between our Epistle and writers of all times from Plato and Philo downwards to John of Damascus" (d. 750), and "perhaps still later to Photius" (ninth century), concluded that it could

[1] Overbeck's criticisms were endorsed by R. B. Drummond in the *Academy*, Jan. 1873 (vol. iv., no. 64, pp. 27–9); but they were severely handled by Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, pp. 270–286, by Dräseke, *op. cit.*, and by Krüger, *Z. w. Th.*, 1894, pp. 206–223.

not have been written earlier than the eighth or ninth century, and proceeded to describe the work and character of Stephanus with the evident idea of insinuating that he "was guilty of some trick, or at least conscious of some mystery belonging to the Epistle." Dr. Hort, in a letter to the *Academy* in May 1877, repudiating the authorship of the article which had been attributed to him, dismissed its claims to credence briefly but effectively with the happy remark that it was "an interesting and unsuspicious example of the criticism which cannot see the wood for the trees." Two years later the writer disclosed his identity by publishing a learned work entitled *Peregrinus Proteus*, which he described as "an investigation into certain relations subsisting between *De Morte Peregrini*, the two epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, and other writings, by J. M. Cotterill, in pursuance of an inquiry into the *Epistle to Diognetus* begun in the *Church Quarterly Review*, 1877." The "other writings" proved to range from the *Evangelium Thomæ* to Galen's *De Prænotione ad Epigenem Liber*, and from chapters xxix and xxx of Basil's work *On the Holy Spirit*, to the *Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe* of the Greek novelist Achilles Tatius. On the ground of a large array of coincidences of language between pairs or groups of these works they were all now pronounced spurious, and

transferred from their reputed authors to an eccentric scribbler of a later age. "We have to do with a literary Proteus who, at one time, derides the vainglorious Peregrinus, at another portrays primitive purity in faith (or perhaps in mode of living), or lashes with his satire the extravagant developments of later times. Again, like a chameleon which adapts itself to the colour of the ground on which it finds itself, as the interpolator of Photius' *Bibliotheca* he gives excerpts from history, ecclesiastical or secular, and fictitious accounts of documents which were never written, or true accounts of writings of which he himself was the author. Wearied of these shapes he assumes the form, it may be, of a medical treatise, or laughs at us in an indecent love story. We have shown above that the *Oratio* printed by H. Stephens in 1592 is one of the members of the group, and that it was published by him with the full knowledge of its spurious character. We know him to have been equally aware of the true character of the equally spurious *Epistle to Diognetus*, the companion *Oratio*. An interesting light is thus thrown upon his reference to Proteus in connection with his own parodies." And again, "It would be hardly possible to find a man more eminently fitted for our literary Proteus than the person who takes such pains to identify himself with Nicephorus Callistus, sometime patriarch of Constantinople, but of whom almost

nothing is known beyond what the history itself acquaints us with." "It has been shown that Henry Stephens knew of this fraud and lent himself to it right willingly. He was an accessory after the fact certainly, possibly one of the principals; but we must look to somewhat earlier times than those of Henry Stephens for the person who took the initiative." This extraordinary theory has been stated at some length in its author's own words in order that it may pass sentence upon itself. It is a strange perversion of criticism which can waste learning upon a morally unthinkable hypothesis, and remain blind to deeper things than literary accidents.

The recoil from such eccentricities of criticism as Donaldson's and Overbeck's left conjecture content to wander around within the obvious limits of the second and third centuries. The last suggestion of literary dishonesty in the writer of the Epistle came from the author of *Supernatural Religion*, who, in the course of his depreciation of the testimony of the Epistle to the writings of S. John, remarked incidentally that it "may have been and probably was written expressly in imitation of early Christian feeling."[1] Most recent criticism has started with the natural presupposition that the Epistle is genuine, *i. e.* that it is a real letter or treatise written by a Christian to an inquirer, and

[1] 6th ed., 1875, i. 39.

has proceeded on that basis to discuss the internal indications of the date of the Epistle. On no other basis can they be discussed in any real sense. If the writer is honestly addressing an inquirer, or even putting forth a real apology in the form of an open letter to an imaginary inquirer, he will reveal naturally and simply the conditions of his day, and we can argue safely, even though the evidence may not carry us very far. If, on the other hand, the letter is an artificial composition with no practical objective, then the writer may throw himself into any historical setting that he cares to imagine or recall, and we cannot argue from that setting to the actual time of the writing; all that we can argue will be the unpractical question, whether he has succeeded in depicting any set of conditions that did ever occur, or whether he has blended the features of two or more epochs in one.

Certain of the internal indications have been unduly pressed in favour of an earlier date even than Justin. (*a*) Christianity is called "new," and is described as having "now" come into the world. But Tertullian in the third century, and Eusebius in the fourth, use similar language. Christianity was even then still new in contrast to paganism and to Judaism.

(*b*) The Jewish sacrifices and ritual are described in the present tense as though they were still practised, and Tillemont was inclined to place

the Epistle even before the fall of Jerusalem. But apart from the evidence[1] which seems to show that the sacrifices were actually continued in some places, at least in private, long after this catastrophe, it is certain that the Jew regarded the whole system as still obligatory, even if at present impracticable; and a Christian might well discuss Judaism on that basis as a present fact.

(*c*) The references to persecution have been variously assigned: to the age of Trajan (martyrdom of Ignatius, c. 112), of Antoninus Pius (especially 151–155), and more probably to that of Marcus Aurelius (161–180). The emphasis laid on the growth of the Christian community in spite or in consequence of persecution is a feature that would be true to life at more than one epoch. Pliny, the Roman magistrate, at the beginning of the second century, and Tertullian, the Christian apologist, at the end of that century are alike witnesses to the rapid expansion of Christianity under hostile pressure. All that can be said is that these references are so vivid and natural that they must be taken to indicate recent, if not present, persecution. It is difficult to regard them as the imagination of a writer living in the post-Nicene age, when paganism itself was fighting for its existence in a Christian empire.

[1] Donaldson, *op. cit.*, ii. 135; Kihn, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 70.

Two other indications have been thought to fix the date of the Epistle more precisely.

(*d*) The Jews are described as "waging war" upon Christians as "aliens" (ch. v, § 17). Bunsen[1] regarded this as a reminiscence of recent Jewish outrages upon the Christians of Palestine, whom the Jews hated as traitors to the national cause; he dated the Epistle accordingly just after the second Jewish war, the revolt under Bar-Cochba in 132–135. Hefele,[2] on the other hand, took the anti-Jewish tone of the Epistle as marking the hostile attitude into which the Christians were driven by the bitterness of Jewish enmity after the fall of Jerusalem, an attitude which gave place to a calmer view of Judaism only after the Bar-Cochba war had removed the danger of a national revival of Judaism. He would date the Epistle therefore before the war. But it should probably be placed after the war. Diognetus seems to have been quite clear as to the fact that the Christians were distinct from the Jews (ch. i.); and it was this war which finally convinced the Roman world that Christians were not a mere Jewish sect.[3]

(*e*) The comparison of God's mission of His Son to a king sending his son as a king (ch. vii, § 4) has been taken as a reference to the occasion when Antoninus Pius conferred the tribunician power

[1] *Analecta Ante-Nicæna*, i. 103.

[2] *Patr. Apost. Op.*, ed. 4, lxxxix. [3] Kihn, pp. 57–69.

upon M. Aurelius in 147, or when M. Aurelius associated his adopted son L. Aelius with himself in 161, or still more likely when M. Aurelius shared his imperial rank with his own son Commodus and sent him on an imperial mission to the frontier in 176–177.[1] But, of course, this is only conjecture. The writer may have had in mind more than one instance of this not uncommon policy, or he may have thought of his illustration quite apart from any such historical fact.

Harnack finally refused to define the date more precisely than as lying somewhere between 170 and 310.[2] He considered that the earlier part of the period left open by the references to persecution (110–310) was ruled out of probability (*a*) by the lack of originality of ideas in the Epistle, (*b*) by the absence of any sense of stern conflict (?), (*c*) by the flowing rhetoric of "the Catholic homilist." But the third quarter of the second century (150–175) has in its favour the opinion of not a few scholars, and seems to satisfy the evidence, such as it is. The traditional assignment of the Epistle to Justin, whose Apologies date from 140–155, and its association in the codex with early writings also assigned to Justin, suggest the middle of the second century. The doctrine of the Epistle implies some such date. Its Christology, if more advanced than

[1] Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers* (1 vol., ed. Harmer), Intr. to *Epistle to Diognetus.* [2] *Chronol. d. altchrist. Litt.*, i. 514.

that of Justin, is less elaborate and precise than that of Origen. It has no doctrine of the Holy Spirit (see p. 41). It is prior to the age of clearly-defined heresies. It contains no reference to any contemporary heresy; and its own theology is expressed incidentally in simple language that is capable of misinterpretation as heretical just because the writer is unconscious of any such danger. He could write as he did just because no heretic had yet used those expressions in proof or support of his views, and the Christian faith had therefore not yet grown careful of its phraseology. The only heresy of which there is any echo in the Epistle is the early Gnosticism which separated the Jewish from the Christian God, and degraded the Christ from His unique Sonship. Harnack is inclined to find support for his late date in the fact that "though the writer nowhere alludes to the Gnostic conflict his theology is built on the results of that conflict." It seems rather as if the writer were contemporary with the conflict. But even if Harnack is right in seeing fruits of victory rather than signs of conflict, or at least of transition, still such a view is not inconsistent with a date in the middle of the second century. The "real crisis" of the Gnostic invasion of the Church was over before 170. "The simple vitality of the Catholic tradition"[1] had won the day, and it only remained

[1] Bate, *Hist. of Church to* A.D. 325, p. 62.

for the great anti-Gnostic writers, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, to complete and to record the triumph.

III. AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE

THE absence of evidence has left conjecture free, and scholars have made the most of their freedom. *Quot homines, tot sententiæ.*[1] Almost every scholar has produced a candidate for the honour of the authorship of this unclaimed "gem of the patristic age." Baratier in 1740 suggested Clement of Rome; Gallandi in 1742, and Lumper in 1785, thought of Apollos; Dorner in 1845 pressed the claim of Quadratus, the earliest known apologist, identified by Jerome with the Bishop of Athens of that name (c. 126). But these are pure conjectures. A few other suggestions can be supported by something at least in the way of internal indications; but "in the absence of external evidence," as Westcott said, "they serve only to express the character of the Epistle."[2] They merely call attention to certain special features of style or teaching which resemble the language of some known author. There are only three or four

[1] See the sketch of this array of conjectures in Kihn (p. 12 foll.)

[2] *Canon of the N. T.*, 4th ed., 1875, p. 86.

answers to the question of authorship which are probable enough to need discussion.

(i) The first is the answer of the *Codex Argentoratensis*, which places the Epistle immediately after works assigned to Justin Martyr, and heads it with the title, "By the same author," *i. e.* Justin. But the authorship of Justin, doubted already by Tillemont in 1691, has since been questioned or denied by nearly all scholars, even at last by Otto, who in 1882 abandoned his long advocacy of Justin's claim. Briefly, Justin's views of idolatry as the seat and instrument of spiritual powers of evil, of Judaism as a divine preparation for the Gospel, of the Gospel itself as the completion of the work of the "seminal word" in the minds of all men, not least of the Greek philosophers—these are quite foreign to the teaching and tone of the Epistle. Even if the distance thus estimated between them be diminished by resemblances between other sayings of the writer and of Justin, the argument from style is conclusive. Justin's Greek is not to be compared to the Greek of the unknown author of the Epistle.[1]

(ii) Bunsen was led by the author's repudiation of Judaism to assign the Epistle to Marcion (c. 140–150). The silence of Christian literature seemed to Bunsen to be capable of explanation on the supposition that the Epistle itself was regarded

[1] Westcott, *l. c.*

with suspicion, on the ground of its heretical authorship.[1] But the doctrine of the Epistle is either non-Marcionite or anti-Marcionite. The apparent repudiation of the claims of the Old Testament as a divine revelation is indeed a coincidence with the peculiar teaching of Marcion; but it is the only coincidence, and it is after all largely an inference from silence, it is not deliberate and positive as it is in Marcion. Judaism is condemned as a cult; the Jewish Scriptures, with the exception of a few reminiscences of their language, are simply ignored, naturally enough in an Epistle to a Greek inquirer. The Old Testament as a whole is not condemned; it is not considered at all. On the other hand the theology of the Epistle is distinctly anti-Marcionite. To Marcion the coming of the Son was the good God's way of saving men from the lower God, the Demiurgus or Creator; to our writer the Logos is Himself Creator (Demiurgus) and Artificer, and the Father is also Creator and Maker and Lord. There is no room in the Epistle for Marcion's idea of the antagonism between the hard and cruel Creator-God of the Jews and the good and loving Father-God revealed through Christ. There is instead one God, always good and loving in Himself, only withholding the revelation of His goodness and love, at all cost of apparent negligence,

[1] *Analecta Ante-Nicæna*, i. 103–105; *Hippolytus and his Age*, i. 170–3.

until man had learned his providential lesson of need.

(iii) Dräseke[1] made out an ingenious case on behalf of the authorship of Apelles the Marcionite. He accounted for the orthodox character of the Epistle on the subject of the unity of God and the necessity of faith as the sole channel of divine knowledge (ch. viii, § 6) by supposing that Apelles came round from the distinctive tenets of Gnosticism to the Catholic position at the close of his life at Rome (c. 180). This theory has the advantage of explaining the supposed use of the Epistle by Tertullian, who was at Rome at the end of the second century. But it is a theory based on scanty evidence. Its chief value is that it calls attention to an apparently Gnostic element in the Epistle. Three points have been noted under this head: (*a*) the emphasis laid upon the Son as the unique revelation of God to man (ch. vii); (*b*) the mention of spiritual powers entrusted with the administration of things in heaven and earth (ch. vii, 2); (*c*) the reference to God as unchanging, good and dispassionate (ch. viii, 8). But it is obvious that these are not peculiarly Gnostic doctrines, though they are found in Gnostic writings. The description of God as unknown in Himself and only revealed in Christ and to faith is Johannine (Joh. i. 18). The allusion to spiritual beings exercising

[1] *Der Brief an D.*, pp. 122 foll.

authority in God's service goes little or no further than S. Paul's language with reference to the "principalities" and "powers" of the unseen world (*e.g.* Col. i. 16). Neither are these doctrines introduced in a Gnostic context. The goodness of God is not stated in contrast to any idea of an inferior God, but in repudiation of the idea that the delay of His revelation implied a want of love for man. On the other hand the Christology of the Epistle is decidedly anti-Gnostic. The Son is not identified with the world but is distinct from the world. As Dorner points out,[1] He is eternal with the Father; He is the eternal principle which finds expression in the Creation and in the Incarnation. The chronological relation of the Epistle, however, to the Gnosticism outside the Church is not so clear. Harnack[2] places the Epistle after the conflict between Gnosticism and the faith of the Church. Kihn,[3] on the contrary, assigns the Epistle to that period in which the false *gnosis* was but a heretical tendency not yet developed into those manifold sects which on some points came so near to Christian truth and on others receded so far away.

(iv) The last conjecture that deserves special

[1] *Doctrine of the Person of Christ.* (E. Tr. 1861, Div. i, vol. i., p. 263 n.).

[2] *Chronol.*, i. p. 514.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 136.

consideration is that which was advocated in various forms by Doulcet[1] and Kihn[2] and Krüger.[3] It is the identification of the unknown writer with the Aristides whose Apology to the emperor, long known in Syriac and Armenian versions, was only discovered in Greek some fifteen years ago. There are indeed close resemblances between the language of the Epistle and that of the Apology, and the first impression left by the comparison is that the one writer used the other, or that both works came from the same pen. The most elaborate of the theories built upon the supposed relation between the Epistle and the Apology is that of Kihn. According to this theory the author of the Epistle is Aristides, Diognetus (*i.e.* son of Zeus) is the emperor Hadrian, and the Epistle is the initiation of Diognetus into the Christian mysteries, for which the Apology of Aristides has prepared the way. The chapters on paganism and Judaism, exposing their falsehood in doctrine or in practice, are his "purification" (*κάθαρσις*); the chapters on the Christian revelation are his "instruction" (*κατὰ Θεὸν παιδαγωγία*); the last two chapters (chs. xi, xii), with their fascinating picture of Christian mysticism and worship, are his *ἐποπτεία Θεοῦ*, his glimpse into the inmost sanctuary of the true faith. The argu-

[1] *Revue des Questions Historiques*, vol. xxviii. (1880), pp. 601-612.

[2] *Der Ursprung d. Briefes an D.* (1882), pp. 95-154.

[3] *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* (1894), xxxvii., pp. 206-223.

ment is clever but unconvincing. The evidence will not justify more than the bare supposition that our author is perhaps the author of the Apology. The difference between the two works, whether in the omission in one of matter found in the other, or in the varying treatment of topics on which both have something to say, are not more than might be explained by the difference of purpose. The Apology is a deprecatory petition to an emperor; the Epistle is an explanatory letter to an inquirer. Points of resemblance will be mentioned in the notes to the translation of the Epistle. But one of these resemblances is the absence from both works of a topic which requires a fuller notice here. Overbeck[1] laid emphasis upon the silence of the Epistle on the subject of the argument from prophecy, the one theoretical proof, he thinks, which the apologists of the second century were able and eager to offer to their pagan opponents. But this same silence is observable in the Apology of Aristides also; there is not a word to indicate that the writer saw in the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy an instrument of primary importance which the Christian apologist must never omit to use. Whatever be the true explanation of this silence in the Epistle it is plain that the silence

[1] In *Studien z. Gesch. d. alten Kirche*, 1875, and more fully in *Theol. Litt. Zeitung*, 1882, p. 34 foll. Overbeck's view is controverted by Hilgenfeld, *Z. w. Th.*, 1873, p. 277; and by Krüger, *Z. w. Th.*, 1894, pp. 212, 213.

cannot be pressed as an argument against its being a production of the second century. Probably the explanation is to be found in a change of front to meet a new attack. The critical pagan objected to Christianity as a novelty in the way of religion. The apologist, face to face with this new objection, laid aside the argument from prophecy—so essential in controversy with the Jews, so useful in proving to the pagan that Christianity had a history before its appearance—and explained the newness itself as a part of the divine plan. When the pagan argued that Christianity was new in character, a fresh departure, the Christian answered that his religion was in fact the last stage of a long process of revelation. When the pagan objected that Christianity was new in point of time, a late arrival, the Christian replied that it could not have come sooner—the sense of moral need had first to be created in man. The apparent inaction of God was a silent activity. So explained, the newness of the Christian religion became, in the hands of the apologist, a proof of its divine origin.

To return to the relation of the Epistle and the Apology, we may dissent from the argument that the Epistle, in spite of certain resemblances, is separated from the Apology by its tone and general setting, that in the Apology we have "powerful touches from real life," whereas in the Epistle we find "ingenious paradoxes and reflec-

tions" on the subject of the Christian character, and an "academic calm" on the subject of persecution, and that the distance in time, involved in such a contrast, precludes the idea of the two works coming from one pen.[1] But it is certainly true that the resemblances do not amount to a proof of identity of authorship. Their evidence would be satisfied by the supposition that the unknown writer knew and imitated the work of Aristides, or that he was an independent example of the type of apologetics represented by Aristides. But the problem proves after all to be triangular. There are several close resemblances between these two works which we have been considering and a third, the *Preaching of Peter* (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου), a non-canonical writing which exercised a wide influence on the Christian literature of the second century, and which survives only in a number of fragments quoted in the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria.[2] It was apparently an account of the missionary work and teaching of S. Peter among the Gentiles. Its date is generally placed in the first quarter of the second century. Its origin is unknown, but there is much that is suggestive in the conjecture of Von Dobschütz [3] that it was the

[1] Ulhorn in Hauck's *Realencycl. Theol. u. Kirche*, iv. 677.

[2] See Salmon, article on *Preaching of Peter*, in *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* (vol. iv., ed. 1887) ; Chase, in Hastings' *Dict. of Bible*, iii. 776.

[3] *Texte u. Untersuch.*, 1893, xi. 1.

work of a Christian of Alexandria, and was written as a supplement to the Gospel according to S. Mark. Its contents seem certainly to have been analogous to those of the Acts of the Apostles which S. Luke wrote as a supplement to his Gospel. A translation of the fragments which bear upon the study of the *Epistle to Diognetus* will be found in the notes to the Epistle. A careful examination of the resemblances between the three works led Dr. Armitage Robinson[1] to reject the idea that Aristides had the Epistle before him, and also the converse idea that the writer of the Epistle borrowed from the Apology. From the fact that there are points in common between the *Preaching of Peter* and the Apology alone, and again between the *Preaching* and the Epistle alone, he concludes that "we are guided to the hypothesis that the *Preaching of Peter* lies behind both of these works." Such a conclusion as this, of course, cuts much of the ground from under the various theories built upon the supposed relation between the Epistle and the Apology, apart from the *Preaching*. As a matter of fact Krüger, one of the advocates of the theory of the identity of Aristides and the author of the Epistle, has abandoned the theory.[2]

[1] *Texts and Studies*, i. pp. 95–97 (1891).

[2] For his argument in favour of the theory, see *Z. w. Th.*, 1894, pp. 206–223. Ehrhard, *Altchr. Litt.*, i. 251, refers to

Here we must leave the question of authorship.[1]

Harnack in 1878 confined himself to the statement that it was the work of a writer between 170 and 310, who "used the Gnostic controversy to define and adorn Christian truth, who might perhaps be styled a Catholic Marcion, who certainly blended in one graceful whole the best thoughts of Tatian, and some of the doctrines of the Alexandrian school."[2] Westcott, while dating the Epistle much earlier, was content to say that "we can regard it as the natural outpouring of a Greek mind holding converse with a Greek mind in the language of old philosophers."[3]

IV. THE INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE: CHAPTERS XI AND XII

THE evidence cited in preceding sections has been drawn entirely from the first ten chapters of

Krüger's *Nachträge*, p. 20, for its abandonment. See also *Z. w. Th.*, 1896, pp. 169–174.

[1] The Rev. E. B. Birks, in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*, ii. 162–167, argued eloquently for the identity of the author of the Epistle with the author of the writing "To Greeks" (see p. 7 of this Introduction), and identified the writer with Ambrosius, a Greek councillor who became a Christian. The two writings would, in that case, be successive stages of an apology. But suggestive as Mr. Birks' article is throughout, its main argument remains merely a conjecture.

[2] Gebhardt and Harnack, *Patr. Apost. Op.* I. 2, p. 152.

[3] *Canon of N. T.*, ed. 1875, p. 86.

the Epistle. At the abrupt close of chapter x there was a marginal note in the Strassburg MS. stating that "here the copy had a break." It was a gap of half-a-line in the Strassburg MS., or about fifteen letter-spaces in the Tübingen transcript, and in the latter the line was completed after the break by the first two words of chapter xi. Kihn suggested therefore that the gap might be filled in this way: "(In teaching thus) I am advocating no strange doctrine," and maintained that chapters xi and xii were thus proved to be part of the letter.[1] But the evidence has satisfied almost all scholars that the last two chapters are no part of the letter but a fragment of a later work.[2] They differ in marked ways from the earlier chapters. There (chs. i–x) it is the moral and spiritual life of the Christian that is prominent; here (chs. xi, xii) it is the Church as the home of grace and instruction and worship. There the Christian faith is pre-eminently the objective revelation of God in Christ, which awakens love in the heart of man; here it is regarded on its subjective, mystical side as the true knowledge or *gnosis*. There the writer is plainly addressing an inquirer; here we seem to have the conclusion of a homily to catechumens

[1] *Der Ursprung, etc.*, p. 48.

[2] See especially Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, i. 294, 295; Funk, *Patr. Apost.*, vol. i., pp. cxviii, cxix.

of an advanced stage.[1] These contrasts, it is true, are perhaps capable of explanation. It may be the same writer who is dealing with the same reader, not now as an inquirer but as a coming disciple. The vindicating and yet the safeguarding of Christian knowledge, the portraying of the beauty and order of the life of the Church, these may be a vision of promise intended to encourage and confirm the man whom the writer believes himself to have already convinced. This view might be a valid explanation of the difference in the matter of the two documents. But it fails to account for the different attitude of the writer on certain important questions which occur both in the earlier and in the later part of the work. There the preparatory function of prophecy is ignored, and the very reasonableness of the Jewish system of sacrifice and ritual is denied; here the fear of the law is praised, and the grace of the prophetic order is recognized. Whether this praise refers to lection, or hymn, or sermon, it is clear that law and prophecy are reckoned emphatically with gospel and tradition as treasures of Church life and teaching. At the same time, in these last two

[1] The change from the singular "thou" of chapters i–x to the plural "you" of chapters xi, xii, is not conclusive, for it is not consistent. In chapters i–x Diognetus is occasionally merged in the plural as representing the Greek world; in chapters xi, xii, the singular is occasionally used to bring the responsibility of knowledge home to the individual Christian.

chapters the Genesis narrative of Paradise and the Fall is handled freely in allegorical fashion. In fact the first part of the letter is "everywhere marked by the characteristics of Greece; the second by those of Alexandria. The one, so to speak, sets forth truth rationally, and the other mystically. The centre of the one is faith; of the other knowledge."[1] Again, the argument contemplated in the first chapter is completed and the questions all answered before the end of chapter x. And at the close of chapter xi the author describes himself as speaking out of the purely missionary spirit of the true disciple of the Word, whereas the earlier chapters are avowedly written in answer to the questions of Diognetus. There no formal reference is made to Holy Scripture; here, in chapter xii, § 5, a text is quoted (1 Cor. ix. 10) as a saying of "the apostle." The conclusion seems irresistible. The tenth chapter may have ended originally with its present abrupt glance at the judgment which is to come on persecutor and persecuted alike, or the lacuna in the text may indicate the loss of an original peroration. But in any case the two chapters that now follow are the work of a later author, or a fragment of some writing contemporary with the letter, but appended to the letter by a later editor. It may have been added by him as a deliberate completion or modi-

[1] Westcott, *Canon of N. T.*, p. 87.

fication of the letter. Otto suggested that the addition was made to remove from the letter the charge of indifference or opposition to the claims of the Old Testament and to the teaching office of the Church. Or it may have been a literary waif rescued from destruction and attached to the letter by a transcriber, on the ground of fancied similarity of theme or tone. Bunsen[1] imagined that it was the closing fragment which he thought was required to complete the great work of the anti-Gnostic theologian Hippolytus of Rome, the *Refutation of all Heresies.* Dräseke[2] revived this hypothesis in 1902, but Harnack[3] is probably right in doubting whether the *Refutation* needs any such completion. Its traditional ending seems adequate and appropriate. In any case, however, Bunsen and Dräseke did good service in calling attention to the close resemblances which may be recognized between these two chapters and the writings of Hippolytus. Bonwetsch collected fuller evidence of resemblance which practically convinced Harnack that the two chapters came from some lost work of Hippolytus; and Di Pauli[4] has quite recently offered yet further evidence which points suggestively, though not conclusively,

[1] *Hippolytus and his Age* (1854), i. 414–416.
[2] *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1902.
[3] *Altchr. Litt.* (*Chronol.*) II., ii. 232.
[4] *Theol. Quartalschrift*, Jan. 1906, pp. 28–36.

towards Bunsen's theory of a lost peroration of the *Refutation*.

Westcott was inclined to regard this fragment as the work of a Jewish convert of Alexandria on the ground of its allegorical use of Genesis, and welcomed it as a sign of "the Catholic spirit of one division of Jewish Christendom." Its date he placed early in the second century. "The author speaks of himself as a disciple of apostles and a teacher of the Gentiles. The Church, as he describes it, was still in the first stage. The sense of personal intercourse with the Word was fresh and deep. Revelation was not then wholly a thing of the past."[1] On two of these grounds—the allegorical interpretation of Genesis, and the description of the writer as a teacher of Gentiles—Lightfoot came to think of Pantænus, "the apostle of the Indies," and the master of the catechetical school at Alexandria, as the possible author.[2] On the whole the probability leans towards an Alexandrian rather than a Roman origin for this wonderful fragment. The evidence of the parallel passages in Hippolytus is not equally strong in all the cases cited; it might perhaps be matched in detail by a careful study of Clement of Alexandria; it is almost outweighed already by the general impression of this fragment which drew from

[1] *Canon of N. T.*, pp. 88, 92.

[2] *Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Harmer), pp. 488, 489.

Lightfoot the verdict: "Clearly it is Alexandrian, as its phraseology and its sentiments alike show."

But the value of the fragment, like the value of the Epistle, is independent of its authorship. Each of the two has enriched Christian literature with a gem of its own. The letter has preserved the noblest picture of the Christian life in the midst of the world that can be found outside the New Testament. The fragment has given us an ideal view of the place of knowledge (*gnosis*) within the Christian life. It rescues knowledge from its apparent association with heresy, and claims it as part of the Christian heritage. Over against the "science falsely so called" which ran into futile refinements of language or logic, or sank into sheer error, over against the concentration of faith either on the practical issue of Christian love, or on the mystical effort after Christian saintliness, the unknown author sets the conception of a knowledge which is "the highest expression of revealed truth."[1] But it is no mere Gnosticism, purged of error or shorn of exaggeration, that he welcomes within the Church and offers to the Christian. It is a *gnosis* carefully guarded against that isolation from the other elements of the Christian character which is the danger of knowledge. It is a knowledge won by faith, steadied

[1] Westcott, *Canon of N. T.*, p. 91.

by the historic creed of the Incarnation, tempered by love, and proved by life.

V. THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE

(i) *The personality of the Word.*

The Logos is described once in terms that scarcely involve personality (ch. vii, 2): "God Himself from heaven planted among men and established in their hearts the Truth, and the holy, incomprehensible Word." But in most passages, as indeed in the context of this, He is indisputably regarded as a person, and His relation to God is defined as that of a son. The emphasis laid on the sending of the Son by God, and on the communication to Him by God of the great mystery of human salvation, seems at first sight to anticipate or to echo the subordinationism which regarded the Son as inferior to the Father. But it is a subordinationism qualified by its context; for the Son and the Father are both alike described by the term Demiurgus or Creator. The Logos again is depicted rather in His relation to the world and to man, than in His relation to God. This is intelligible enough. Writing to a pagan familiar with the Stoic conception of the universe, the author is naturally concerned rather to dwell at length upon the dignity and the glory of the Word

in Creation, than upon the mystery of the interior life of the Godhead.[1] Yet even in this account of His relation to the universe He appears as the guiding principle rather than as the creative power —in the words of Westcott, "as the correlative to Reason in man rather than as the expression of the creative Will of God."[2]

(ii) *The Incarnation.*

The Incarnation of the Son is regarded as the expression of the love of God. Its purpose was at once to reveal God and to redeem man. There is no hint of any theological difficulty in the relation between the divine and the human in the Incarnate Word. He is God so truly that His coming can be described as the coming of God, His Atonement as God's taking upon Him our sins, His revelation as God's revelation of Himself. On the other hand the Patripassianism which regarded the Father as coming in His own person is ruled out by the insistence upon the distinct personality of "the beloved Son." At the same time He is truly man. He is never called Jesus or Christ; but He is described as sent not only "as God by God," but "as man to men." The very uncertainty whether in chapter vii, § 2, the author is speaking of the implanting of reason in human nature, or of the

[1] Bethune-Baker, *Introduction to Early Christian Doctrine*, p. 123.

[2] *Canon of N. T.*, p. 92, n. 4.

Incarnation of the Word among men, brings us to the philosophical basis of the belief in the Incarnation, viz. the truth that the divine nature can associate the human with Itself because there is in the human nature something that is divine. The writer has no doubt that the Word became flesh.

(iii) *The Atonement.*

The Atonement is described in its effects, not in its method. Ransom, justification, the covering and hiding of sin—there is the objective Atonement stated with a wealth of language and feeling, but without definition. When we are told that in this Epistle "the death of the Son is not stated to be an atoning sacrifice for sin, but rather a supreme manifestation of divine love,"[1] we may surely reply that the antithesis is unnecessary in principle and unwarranted in fact. The writer of the Epistle does not indeed use the word sacrifice, but the idea of sacrifice is implied in the Scriptural language which he quotes. To dispute that idea would be as unreasonable as to say that the writer does not state the death itself because he merely speaks of God giving His Son as a ransom.

At the same time the Atonement is as clearly subjective as it is objective. The word "exchange" is used, but in a context which points perhaps as much to the exchange of iniquity for

[1] Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, i. 188.

righteousness as to the substitution of the Son for sinners. "It is no external act or transaction that effects the object in view. It is a real inner change that is wrought in man."[1] The writer's language on this point recalls his earlier remark that God sent His Son "to persuade, not to force, for force is no part of God's nature" (ch. vii, § 4). Man is not saved without his own response.

(iv) *The Word in the Church and in the Soul.*

In chapters xi, xii the Incarnation is represented as both a historical fact and a spiritual power. It is extended into the life of the Church and of the soul. The Word is still present, Himself the Church's endowment and the Christian's inspiration. It is surprising to find no reference in this context to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. There is no mention of the Spirit in this section, or in the main body of the letter. The "grace" which is not merely the Son's gift to the Church but itself "reveals" and "rejoices" cannot indeed be impersonal, and the writer's appeal to the Christian disciple not to "grieve this grace" seems a conscious reminiscence of S. Paul's pleading with the Ephesians not to "grieve the Holy Spirit" (Eph. iii. 20). Yet the separate personality of the Spirit is not here recognized explicitly; the grace is regarded as the direct working of the Word. This indistinctness, and the tendency to

[1] Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

attribute to the Word what strictly belongs to the Spirit are an indication of that period of the second century in which the doctrine of the Logos was still the dominant truth of Christian theology, as it is in the *Shepherd of Hermas* and in the Apologists.[1]

In chapter xi, § 6, the law, the prophets, the gospels and the apostles are reckoned together among the wealth of the spiritual life of the Church, and the Word is described as teaching through His own chosen teachers. Bishop Westcott[2] remarks: "In this noble sentence we see the first intimation of the co-ordinate authorities of the Bible and the Church, of a written record and a living voice." We may add that as the Word is here the inspiration of the teacher, while in chapter xii, § 10, He is Himself the teacher of the saints, we have also a co-ordination of the teaching of the Church, and the experience of the individual. In this latter doctrine of private inspiration, Westcott remarks elsewhere[3] "it is possible to trace the germs of later mysticism," but "the influence of the Word on the Christian is made to flow from His historical revelation to mankind." Meditation is kept true by the Creed.

[1] Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, pp. 199, 200; more fully, Prof. Swete's article on the Holy Ghost in *Dict. Chr. Biogr.*

[2] *Introduction to Study of Gospels*, ed. 1888, p. 421.

[3] *Canon of N. T.*, ed. 1875, p. 92.

VI. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE

THE following outline is an analysis of the Epistle as it now stands with the two supplementary chapters.

I. The Epistle is an answer to three questions of Diognetus (ch. i):
- A. What is the nature of the faith and worship which lead to
  - (1) fearless martyrdom,
  - (2) abstinence from pagan and Jewish observances?
- B. What is the character of Christian love?
- C. What is the explanation of the late arrival of Christianity in the world?

II. Christians are intolerant (Answer to A 2)
- (1) of Paganism (ch. ii) because its objects of worship are material, its worship irrational;
- (2) of Judaism (ch. iii, 4) because though it is true as a monotheistic creed, it is absurd as a cult, since
- (*a*) it regards God as needing human offerings;
- (*b*) it observes ritual distinctions which are arbitrary in themselves and derogatory to the Creator.

III. Christianity in its character, its origin, its results:
- (1) Its character is seen yet not seen;
  - ch. v, the Christian life is in the world, not of the world;
  - ch. vi, Christians are the soul of the world.
- (2) Its origin is unique as a revelation of God:
  - ch. vii, 1, 2, the majesty of the Word in Himself;
  - 3–6, His mission of love to man;
  - 7–9, His presence the strength of the martyr (Answer to A 1);

ch. viii, 1–6, the nature of God (*a*) undiscovered by philosophers, (*b*) revealed in the Son to faith;
ch. viii 7, ix 1, God's love waiting for man to learn his need (Answer to C);
ch. ix, 2–6, God's love working out man's salvation at last.

(3) Its results are visible in man:
ch. x, 1–6, the imitation of God in love for man (Answer to B);
7, 8, insight into the eternal values of life and death (Answer to A 1).

IV. The Christian *gnosis*—
ch. xi. The Word—
1–3, a historical revelation to the world;
4–8, a present power in the Church and in the soul.
ch. xii. The Church a paradise—
1–8, the union of knowledge and life;
9, the beauty and order of worship.

Nothing is known of Diognetus. He may have been the Stoic Diognetus who was the instructor of Marcus Aurelius, the future emperor, in painting and in the elements of philosophy.[1] Doulcet endeavoured to prove that Diognetus was a pupil of Dionysius the Areopagite, and a witness of his martyrdom.[2] Kestner,[3] regarding Justin as the author of the Epistle, supposed that Diognetus was induced by the young Aurelius to consult Justin on points of inquiry which the Apology had touched but lightly or not at all, and that the

[1] Capitolinus, *Vita Anton. philos.*, c. 4; M. Aurelius, *Comm.* i. 6.

[2] *Revue des Quest. Hist.*, 1880, pp. 601–612.

[3] Quoted by Funk, *Patr. Apost.*, vol. i., p. cxvi.

Epistle was Justin's reply. But we know nothing for certain of the position or character of the inquirer or of the circumstances of the inquiry.

The questions are not answered precisely in the order of their asking. Paganism and Judaism are first dismissed summarily on their own demerits. The writer then describes the condition and the character of Christians in the world, and proceeds to trace the secret of the Christian life back to the divine origin of the Christian revelation embodied in the Incarnation and the Atonement. Incidentally he answers the question why the Christian religion was so late in appearing in the world. The subjective revelation of sin had to precede the objective revelation of the Saviour. The brotherly love of Christians is explained next as the fruit of this revelation of the goodness of God. But the purity of this love has been already vindicated in the course of the description of the Christian life in the world. The martyr's contempt for death is twice explained; once it is attributed to his loyalty to a present Lord (ch. vii, 7–9), once to his belief in the fire of eternal judgment (ch. x, 7, 8).

VII. SOME CRITICISMS OF THE EPISTLE

EXCEPTION has been taken on various grounds to the description which the unknown writer gives of paganism, of Judaism, and of Christianity.

1. Overbeck argued that the paganism of the second century was too strong for a Christian apologist to think that he could dismiss its claims by a summary condemnation of its idolatry. But the writer is not discussing pagan religion and life as a whole; he is merely explaining the refusal of Christians to take part in pagan worship, and he can easily be forgiven the omission to differentiate between the educated and the uneducated pagan, when an enlightened emperor like Hadrian took such trouble to identify himself with the worship of the masses.[1] It would be easy to frame an indictment of unfairness against S. Paul himself by dwelling on what he says of paganism in his epistles, and ignoring his sermon at Athens in Acts xvii. It is more to the point to note that there is no suggestion in our Epistle of the belief of S. Paul (1 Cor. x. 20) and the post-apostolic writers (*e.g.* Justin, 1st *Apol.* ch. ix) that there was a reality behind the idols, and that reality the presence of evil spirits using the false worship as a barrier and a weapon against the true. Yet the writer may have held this belief. He may be dealing here only with the external aspect of pagan idolatry; that was sufficient reason in itself for Christian

[1] Kihn, *Der Urspr.*, etc., pp. 26–31. Overbeck's view is controverted also by Hilgenfeld, *Z. f. w. Th.*, 1873, pp 273–275.

abstinence therefrom, without referring to the principle of evil at the heart of the system.

2. Our author has been represented again as placing Judaism on a level with paganism. As a matter of fact he begins with a word of tribute to Judaism as a creed. Unlike the author of the *Preaching of Peter* he grants that its monotheism is real and true. It is its sacrificial and ritual system that he proceeds to condemn. But his view is certainly startling, for he condemns Judaism not as an anachronism but as an absurdity, not because it refuses to see that its work ended with the Christ but because its practices are irrational and irreverent. Such a sentence can only be justified by confining it strictly to the Judaism of the writer's own day. He was writing in view of a Judaism which had lost its savour while it was still hardening its form. He was writing at a time when Jewish hostility to Christians had found expression in the cruelties of the Bar-Cochba war. Perhaps, too, some touch of the "national anti-Judaism" of the Greek-Christian community was reflecting itself in corresponding views of the Judaistic cult.[1] But after all it is surprising that the writer, even though he was a Greek Christian writing to a pagan Greek, did not remember the Judaism of the past while he was explaining his antipathy to the Judaism of the present.

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Z. f. w. Th.*, 1873, pp. 275–277.

We might have expected him to show some recognition of the fact that the Old Testament itself both contained the strongest protests against the misuse of sacrifice and ritual and recorded also their divine origin.

3. The cold shadow of hostile criticism has fallen even across the beautiful picture of the Christian life in chapters v and vi. The writer is arguing there from the invisible working of Christianity to its supernatural origin. Overbeck objected that Christianity was not invisible in the second century —that all the standing accusations of the pagan world against the Christians proved that Christians were marked men. He objected further that the apologists give no indication of a common social life between Christian and pagan—that such a state of things could only come when a victorious Christianity had entered upon the heritage of the heathen and claimed for its own all the resources of imperial civilization. Hilgenfeld [1] is surely right in replying that in that case the writer of such an Epistle—itself by that time an anachronism—would lay stress not upon the position of Christians in a pagan world but upon the position of a dying paganism in a Christian empire. But Overbeck's description of the writer's argument is itself incorrect. The writer does not mean that Christianity was invisible. Its outward working was visible in

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Z. f. w. Th.*, 1873, pp. 279-280.

every Christian. What he means is that the religious life at the back of the new type of ethics was invisible. The spring which fed the stream was the life "hid with Christ in God." Again, the writer does not say that the Christians had their social life entirely in common with the pagans, and were outwardly merged in pagan society. His point is rather that they were indeed recognizable, but that the distinctive mark of a Christian lay not in peculiar customs and habits but in the fact that his conduct was pure and gentle, and his attitude towards the things of daily life witnessed to ideals which were themselves unseen.

4. A strangely unfavourable criticism of this picture is to be found in Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*. "The much-praised description in the letter to Diognetus (ch. v, 6) is a fine rhetorical achievement, but not much more. The author has given expression in one breath to three points of view—the Christian system of conduct as the highest morality, the unworldliness of Christianity, and the inner life which permits this religion to stand in the midst of the world and join in everything external without contracting a stain. A writer who can weave these ideas so completely into one design either stands on the high level of the fourth Gospel—but it is scarcely possible to promote the author of this letter to that position—or else falls under the suspicion that he is not entirely in earnest

over any of those points of view."[1] Harnack's position is apparently that the apologetic school of that day laid stress mainly upon the ethical aspect of the Christian *politeia*. Such a position is obviously disturbed by the emphasis which the letter to Diognetus lays upon the spiritual life at the heart of that *politeia*. But as Harnack says nothing to prove the incompatibility of the three elements of the Christian life in the one picture, we may well continue to believe that the writer of the letter was in earnest in expressing all three, and was in earnest because he was depicting them from the life, and that even if he cannot be promoted to the level of the evangelist he may yet have caught something of the spirit of the fourth Gospel, and recognized that spirit in the Christianity of his own day.

5. Harnack remarks elsewhere in his great work that in the picture of the soul within the body we have a definite conception of the relation between the Church and the world, which he identifies with the State.[2] He is perhaps too rigid in this indentification of the *kosmos* and the empire. They coincide indeed at many points, but the idea of the word *kosmos* is social and moral rather than political, and is potentially wider than the populations of the Roman provinces. He is too rigid, perhaps, in

[1] *Die Mission u. Ausbreitung d. Christenthums*, p. 186, n. 2.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 193.

speaking of a definite conception at all. The writer of the Epistle is not formulating a theory; he is idealizing facts. Overbeck questioned the accuracy of his description on the ground that Christianity and the world were too far apart in character to be linked in "the dubious Platonic union of body and soul." But the idea of the writer is scarcely that of alliance. It is rather the idea of influence. It is the echo of the Lord's own saying about the salt of the earth and the light of the world. With this idea of influence comes sooner or later the idea of conquest. Overbeck could see in this picture nothing but a "theatrical self-contemplation" which he regarded as proof of a later date: the Christians of the second century were, in his opinion, too earnestly engaged in stern conflict with the world of their day to stand outside and look at themselves. Baur was truer to fact in his estimate of the "*Weltbewusstsein*" of the Christian. It was just this consciousness of his relation to the world which was the "secret spring and strength of his warfare." "He who knows himself to be the soul of the world must indisputably in his day find the reins of the world-supremacy fall of themselves into his hands."[1]

[1] Baur, *Christl. d. drei ersten Jahrh.* 2, A.S. 373 f., quoted by Hilgenfeld, *Z. f. w. Th.*, 1873, p. 281.

TRANSLATION AND NOTES TO DIOGNETUS

1. Since I see, most excellent[1] Diognetus, that thou hast shown an eager desire to understand the religion of the Christians, and art making precise and diligent inquiry about them, what there is in the God whom they trust, and in their worship of Him, that leads them to look beyond the world and despise death, and neither recognize as gods those who are counted such by the Greeks, nor keep the religious observances of the Jews; and what is the nature of the affection which they exhibit towards one another; and why this new race of men or profession of life[2] has come into the world now

[1] *κράτιστε*, an epithet denoting high official rank, cp. Luke i. 3 (Theophilus); in itself independent of moral character, Acts xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3 (Felix), xxvi. 25 (Festus).

[2] *γένος ἢ ἐπιτήδευμα*. Lightfoot Harmer: "What is the nature of this new development or interest which has entered into men's lives?" But the nature of the Christian religion is covered by the first two questions of Diognetus. Diognetus is here asking practically why the Christian religion was so late in coming, if it was the true religion. Race (*γένος*) is used of Christians in a spiritually genealogical sense in Aristides' *Apology* (ch. ii), where they are described as the descendants of Jesus Christ, while the Greeks are descendants of demi-gods. For a full discussion of the expressions "new people," and "third race" see Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*,

and not earlier,—I welcome thy zeal, and I pray God, who bestows upon us the power both to speak and to hear, that it may be given to me to speak in such a way that thou mayest be most helped by what thou hearest, and to thee to hear in such a way that he who speaks may have no cause for regret.

II. Come now, purify thyself of all the ideas that preoccupy thy mind, put aside the familiarity [1] that misleads thee, become as it were a new man [2]

bk. ii. ch. vi. In the Greek text of the *Apology of Aristides* there are three "races," Greeks, Jews and Christians; in the Syriac and Armenian versions of the *Apology* there are four, barbarians, Greeks, Jews, Christians. Three stages may be observed in the use of the term τρίτον γένος. First, it merely means a third kind of worship, etc., as in the *Preaching of Peter* (ap. Clement Alex., *Strom.*, vi. 5 39, 41), "the worship of Greeks and Jews is obsolete, but ye Christians are they who worship (God) in a new way (καινῶς) after a third fashion" τρίτῳ γένει σεβόμενοι. Next, it is a name given to Christians by the pagan world; Tertullian (A.D. 197), "tertium genus dicimur." Finally, it is used by Christians of themselves; Pseudo-Cyprian (A.D. 242–3), "tertium genus sumus." See Harnack, *op. cit.*, II. vi., Excursus on the "drittes Geschlecht."

[1] *i.e.* the influence of custom (pagan ideas, language, etc.) which binds a man to the real ignorance of things. Cp. the use of the word (συνήθεια) in the R. V. of 1 Cor. viii. 7. Lightfoot Harmer, "The habit which leadeth thee astray"; but there is no hint in the Epistle that Diognetus was leading an evil life.

[2] Cp. Eph. iv. 22 foll., where, however, the "new man" is a moral rather than an intellectual transformation.

from the beginning, since thou art about to listen to a doctrine which is itself a new thing, as thou thyself didst acknowledge ;[1] and observe not only with thine eyes but with thine understanding also, what is the real nature and form[2] of those whom you [Greeks] describe and regard as gods. 2. Is not one of them stone, like the stone that is trodden under foot ; another bronze, no better than the utensils moulded for our daily use ; another wood, already decayed ; another silver, requiring a man to guard it against theft ; another iron, corroded by rust ; another earthenware, no more comely than that which has been prepared for the meanest service ? 3. Are not all these made of corruptible material ? Are they not wrought by iron and fire ? Was not one of them fashioned by a stonemason, another by a brazier, another by a silversmith, another by a potter ? Before they were modelled into the form of these gods by the arts of these craftsmen, was not each of them transformed by

[1] Apparently a reference to the expression "new race or profession" which the writer quotes in chapter i from the questions of Diognetus.

[2] *Hypostasis* and *eidos* are the Greek words in the text. For *hypostasis* cp. its use in Heb. i. 3 (R. V.), "the very image of His *substance*." The A. V. there, "person," recalls the later use of the word to which it was restricted in the Trinitarian controversies of the fourth century (*hypostasis* = person, *ousia* = nature). It is inadmissible here, where the personality of these "gods" is so strenuously denied.

its own craftsman, as is still the case?[1] Might not vessels now made of the same material, if they happened to fall into the hands of the same craftsmen, be made similar to images such as these? 4. On the other hand could not these which are now worshipped by you be made by men into vessels like any other? Are they not all deaf, blind, destitute of life, of sense, of motion? Are they not all subject to decay and corruption? 5. These are the things that ye call gods, ye serve them, ye worship them, and ye become completely like unto them.[2] 6. For this reason ye

[1] *Cod. Argent.* ἔτι καὶ νῦν, lit. "even now still." Lachmann conjectured εἰκάζειν, which Bunsen rendered "Was not each left to the mercies of the workman to transform it as he liked?" Lightfoot-Harmer, taking the words in different order, translates, "Was it not possible for each one of them to have been changed in form and made to resemble these several utensils?" In any case the sense is that the shape the identity of the "god," depended on the craftsman, who first converted the original shape of his material into the rough shape of an idol before he gave it its finished form, and who might have given the material the shape of anything that he liked at the outset.

[2] An echo of Ps. cxv. 8, and Ps. cxxxv. 18. Cp. (1) the thought of S. Paul in Rom. i. 18–32 that a degraded idea of the divine nature results in an actual degradation of human nature; and (2) the earlier elaboration of the thought in *Wisdom*, chapters xiii and xiv. In our text, however, as in Ps. cxv. and cxxxv., the words refer to the insensibility rather than to the immorality which results from idolatry. The idolator loses mental power as well as moral purity. Böhl

hate Christians, because they do not regard these things as gods. 7. But with all the honour ye are accustomed and supposed to pay them, are not ye guilty yourselves of greater contempt for them than Christians are? Do ye not heap much greater ridicule and insult upon them by worshipping those that are made of stone and earthenware without troubling to guard them, while ye shut up at night those that are made of silver and gold, and post guards beside them in the daytime for fear they should be stolen? 8. And the very honours that ye think to offer them are more of a punishment if they are sensible of them; if, on the other hand, they are without sensation, then ye convict them of this fact by worshipping them with blood and the fat of victims. 9. Let one of you submit to this treatment, let one of you permit such things to be done to himself. Why, not one single man will voluntarily submit to this infliction, for a man has sensation and reason; the stone submits, for it has no sensation. Certainly ye do not prove by your conduct that it has sensation.[1] 10. Indeed I

---

and Bunsen practically render "You place these images on a complete equality with the Godhead," or "You regard the Godhead as altogether similar to these images"—a parallel to S. Paul's language at Athens, Acts xvii. 29.

[1] Lit. "Ye do not therefore prove its sensation." The word translated "prove" (ἐλέγχειν) is more commonly negative = "convict." We might therefore translate (1) "Ye are not

could say many other things about Christians not being enslaved to gods like these; but if what is here said should seem to any one insufficient, I consider it a waste of time to say more.

III. In the next place I suppose thou art most desirous to hear about their not worshipping after the same fashion as the Jews. 2. Now the Jews, so far as they abstain from the manner of service described above, are right in claiming to worship one God of the universe, and to recognize Him as Lord;[1] but so far as they offer Him this worship

---

therefore condemning its sensation," *i. e.* you are not condemning its tastes, for the sacrifices you offer are such that we cannot believe the "god" to be sensible of them; or (2) "Are ye not thereby disproving the idea of the sensibility of the image?" A change of accent (*οὐκοῦν* for *οὐκ οὖν*) would give (3) "You are by these sacrifices simply disproving the idea of its sensibility." Lightfoot-Harmer's rendering, "Ye convict his sensibility," is ambiguous.

[1] Our author is more lenient than the *Preaching of Peter* (Clem., *Strom.*, vi. 5, 41), which describes the monotheism of the Jews as vitiated by the practical worship of angels, etc.: "Neither worship Him after the manner of the Jews, for though they think that they alone know God, they know Him not, paying service to angels and archangels, month and moon." Cp. the Syriac text of Aristides: "They suppose in their minds that they are serving God, but in the methods of their actions their service is to angels and not to God," etc. The Greek text of Aristides concentrates attention on the unbelief of the Jews in their treatment of the prophets and of Christ: *e.g.* "They worship even now God as the sole ruler of all, but not according to knowledge; for they deny

in similar fashion to the Greeks, they are altogether wrong. 3. For whereas the Greeks present an example of folly by making their offerings to things insensible and deaf, these Jews, on the other hand, ought rightly to regard it as absurdity rather than piety to imagine that they are presenting these offerings to God as though He were in need of them. 4. He that made heaven and earth and all that is in them, and bestoweth upon all of us the things that we need, cannot Himself need any of the things that He Himself provides for those who fancy they are giving them to Him.[1] 5. They who imagine that they are performing sacrifice to Him with blood and fat and whole burnt offerings, and that they are honouring Him by these tributes, seem to me to differ in no respect from those who display the same zeal towards senseless objects; for the latter think to provide offerings for things that cannot partake of the honour, the former for a God who stands in need of nothing.

IV. With regard, however, to their scruples about meats, and their superstitious observance[2] of the

---

the Christ the Son of God, and are like the Gentiles, even if they seem in a way to draw nigh to the truth, from which they (? the Gentiles) wandered far."

[1] Cp. Acts xvii. 24, 25; Ps. l. 8–14. *Cod. Argent.* had a marginal note referring to Isaiah i. 12, but its words are partly undecipherable.

[2] *Deisidaimonia*, the word used in chapter i of the Jewish

Sabbath, and their pride in circumcision, and the affectation of their keeping of fast and new moon—things ridiculous and undeserving of consideration—I think thou hast not any need to learn of me.[1] 2. For to accept some of the things created by God for the use of man as rightly created, and to reject others as useless and unnecessary, is not this plainly wrong? 3. To misrepresent God as forbidding a man to do a good deed on the Sabbath day, is not this irreverent? 4. To boast of the mutilation of the flesh as a testimony of their election, as though they were especially beloved by God on that account, is not this ridiculous? 5. To watch the stars and the moon, and mark

---

religion as a whole, perhaps with a touch of contempt, for the Christian religion is there called *Theosebeia* (the word translated "godliness" in 1 Tim. ii. 10). The substantive is used by Festus of the Jewish religion in Acts xxv. 19 (A. V. "superstition"; R. V. "religion"). The comparative of the adjective is used by S. Paul to the Athenians (Acts xvii. 22: A. V. "too superstitious"; R. V. "somewhat superstitious"; R. V. Marg. "religious").

[1] *Cod. Argent.* omits "not." Otto defends the omission on the ground that the writer does proceed to deal with these four points of Judaism. But they are dealt with so summarily that the negative seems required: "Thou hast no need to learn . . . for it is obvious that to accept . . . is plainly wrong, etc." Lightfoot-Harmer translates: "Their scruples . . . new moon, I do not suppose you need to learn from me, are ridiculous."

thereby the observance of months and days,[1] to divide the arrangements[2] of God and the changes of the seasons according to their own inclinations, and assign some for feasting and others for mourning, who would regard this as an example of piety and not rather of folly? 6. I think therefore that thou hast now learned sufficiently that Christians are right in holding aloof from the vanity and delusion of the pagan world, and from the

[1] Cp. Gal. iv. 10 of the Judaising Christians: "Ye observe days and months, and times and years." The verb "observe" there is the same as the substantive "observance" here. The Jews fixed the beginning of the Sabbath and other days from the rising of the stars. One star meant still day; two stars twilight; three, night. A man working on Friday evening after three stars were visible was guilty of Sabbath-breaking. For the moon, cp. *Preaching of Peter* (loc. cit.): "If the moon appear not, they keep not the Sabbath called the first, nor the new moon, nor the unleavened bread, nor the feast (*i. e.* Pentecost), nor the great day" (*i. e.* of Atonement). The Syriac text of Aristides (*Apol.* ch. xiv) connects these practices with angelolatry: "Their service is to angels and not to God, in that they observe Sabbaths, and new moons, and the passover, and the great feast, and the fasts, and circumcision, and cleanness of meats—which things not even thus have they perfectly observed."

[2] Lit. "economies" (*οἰκονομίας*). The word means lit. the management of a household, and is used of various workings of divine providence, *e. g.* the gradual revelation of truth, the "dispensation" of the Gospel (1 Cor. ix. 17; Eph. i. 9, iii. 2). Here it means simply the regulation of the movements of the heavenly bodies.

punctiliousness and pride of the Jews;[1] but as for the mystery of their own religion, expect not to be able to learn that from man.[2]

V. For Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind by country, or by speech, or by customs.[3] 2. For they do not dwell in cities of

[1] Lightfoot-Harmer translates: "From the common (κοινῆς) silliness and error of the Jews, and from their excessive fussiness and pride." But the words "of the Jews" clearly belong in the Greek to the second phrase alone. "Common" may mean common both to Greek and Jewish cults (so Funk takes it). But the author seems to be summing up his answer to Diognetus' first question as to the attitude of Christians towards pagan and Jewish worship. "Common" is therefore probably a deliberate contrast to "Jews"; it means in that case "general," "popular," and refers to the Greek or pagan world at large; cp. the use of ἡ κοινὴ (the common language) for the Hellenistic Greek spoken throughout the East. The two features singled out of each of the two religions are on this interpretation strikingly appropriate. Pagan religion was for its adherents a "vanity," a moral failure; it led nowhere. In many of its exponents it was a conscious "imposture." Judaism was marred by its πολυπραγμοσύνη, its "fussy" and punctilious multiplication of rule and ritual in daily life, and by the "pride" which forgot that privilege spelt responsibility.

[2] Funk, "non verbis hominis . . . sed gratia Dei vitam Christianam vivens." The secret of Christianity cannot be explained by the words of a teacher; it must be experienced in the life of the learner, lived by the grace of God. In the next chapter the writer describes that life. Hence the opening word "for."

[3] *Cod. Argent.* has ἔσθεσι, *i. e.* clothing. But symmetry is

their own, or use a different language, or practise a peculiar life. 3. This knowledge of theirs has not been discovered [1] by the thought and effort of inquisitive [2] men ; they are not champions of a human doctrine, as some men are. 4. But while

---

in favour of the conjecture ἔθεσι, *i. e.* customs. We have then in § 1 an exact parallel to § 2: country, speech, customs ; cities, language, life.

[1] The Greek word εὑρημένον, "discovered," is a conjecture of Stephanus and Beurer. The codex had εἰρημένον, "proclaimed to them." Sylburg suggested ᾑρημένον, "adopted by them."

[2] Or "intrusive," "meddlesome." It is the adjective from which is formed the substantive translated "punctiliousness," or "fussiness," in chapter iv. (1) Perhaps there is a reference here to the refinements of Rabbinical schools. In that case the "human doctrine" may refer to Greek philosophy as being largely the work of a few individual thinkers. The *Cod. Argent.* had a marginal note: "Christians hold not to the teaching of a man. For the Apostle Paul says, 'I received it not from man'" (Gal. i. 12). (2) If both refer to Greek thought the epithet "inquisitive," or "curious," may be illustrated by the character given to the Athenians in Acts xvii. 21. (3) Perhaps the language is too general to be given any special reference. The idea is probably that a system of religion starting from men who share the current conceptions of life has to find and maintain its own distinctness in peculiarities of manner and custom. Christianity, on the contrary, needs no distinctive mark in the ordinary things of life, because its origin is divine, and its distinctive character lies in a divine life within, which does not adopt or reject particular social customs, but transforms them all.

they dwell in Greek or barbarian [1] cities according as each man's lot was cast, and follow the customs of the land in clothing and food, and other matters of daily life, yet the condition of citizenship [2] which they exhibit is wonderful, and admittedly beyond all expectation. 5. They live in countries of their own, but simply as sojourners ; they share the life of citizens, they endure the lot of foreigners ; every foreign land is to them a fatherland, and every fatherland a foreign land. 6. They marry like the rest of the world, they beget children, but they do not cast their offspring adrift. 7. They have a common table, but not a common bed.[3] 8. They

[1] In chapter i and chapter v, §. 17, Greeks are contrasted with Jews. Here the Jew is included among the "barbarians." Cp. Justin, *Apol.*, i. 46, where the good men of old are described as in a sense Christian ; "for instance, among the Greeks Socrates and Heracleitus and the like, among the barbarians Abraham and Elias . . . and many others."

[2] Gk. *politeia*. Cp. the substantive *politeuma* in Phil. iii. 20, where A. V. has "conversation," *i. e.* general conduct, while R. V. gives in the text "citizenship," and in the margin "commonwealth." *Politeia* from meaning civic or political behaviour came to mean life and conduct in general, cp. the verb πολιτεύεσθαι (= live) in Acts xxiii. 1 and Phil. i. 27. Eusebius in the fourth century can even describe the earthly life of the Incarnate Son as "His *politeia* in the flesh" (ἡ ἔνσαρκος πολιτεία, H. E. I. iii. 21). Here in our text the idea of the condition of the citizen and the conduct of the man are still blended.

[3] Κοίτην, the conj of Prudentius (see p. 8) adopted by Bunsen. If this was the original text, it was perhaps the source

exist in the flesh, but they live not after the flesh. 9. They spend their existence upon earth, but their citizenship is in heaven. 10. They obey the established laws, but in their own lives they surpass the laws.[1] 11. They love all men, and are persecuted by all. 12. They are unknown, and yet they are condemned; they are put to death, and yet they give proof of new life. 13. They are poor,

---

of Tertullian's famous "omnia indiscreta apud nos præter uxores," *i. e.* we Christians share everything but wives (*Apol.* c. 39). But *Cod. Argent.* had κοινήν, *i. e.* common; lit. a common table but yet not common (cp. Otto's *gemeinsamen, nicht aber gemeinen*), common in the sense of neighbourly hospitality or congregational fellowship (perhaps an allusion to the *agape* or love-feast), but not common in the sense of impure or profane. More precisely, "not common" may mean (*a*) not polluted by meat offered to idols, cp. 1 Cor. x., or (*b*) not polluted by immoral licence (cp. the repudiation of such slanders in Justin, *Apol.* i. 26–7), or by the eating of human flesh which was rumoured to take place in their secret worship, or more probably (*c*) not profane, but "consecrated by the word of God and thanksgiving," 1 Tim. iv. 5.

[1] *i. e.* they exhibit a higher ideal of life than the law of the land. Not "gain a victory over the laws" (Bunsen) as though the idea were that the lives of Christians disarmed and won over their official persecutors. Funk aptly compares Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* vi. 23, 21), who speaks of the man "who follows the law of God" as "not merely obeying public laws but being above all laws." We might go back to S. Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 21, "Not being without law to God, but under law to Christ," though the reference there is to the Apostle's attitude to men under or not under the Jewish law.

and yet make many rich; they lack everything, and yet in everything they abound. 14. They are dishonoured, and their dishonour becomes their glory; they are reviled, and yet are vindicated. 15. They are abused, and they bless; they are insulted, and repay insult with honour. 16. They do good, and are punished as evil-doers; and in their punishment they rejoice as finding new life therein.[1] 17. The Jews war against them as aliens;[2]

[1] Cp. §§ 11–16 carefully with 2 Cor. vi. 9, 10. The reminiscences are unmistakable. But this is no case of "mere plagiarism" (*Supernatural Religion*, ii. 358, 6th ed., 1875). (*a*) The main idea is different. In 2 Cor. vi. we have a picture of the ministerial life, here a picture of Christian life in general. (*b*) There are interesting differences in detail. In 2 Cor. vi. the contrast is between the ways in which the Apostle was understood by some and misunderstood by others; here it is between the general ignorance of pagans on the subject of the Christian life, and the popular or official condemnation of Christians in spite of (or because of) that ignorance. In 2 Cor. vi. the antithesis is between the daily dying of the hard-pressed Apostle and the inner life that sustained him; here it is between the death of the martyrs and the renewed energy of the Church.

[2] Cp. Justin, *Apol.* i. 31: "The Jews regard us with personal enmity (ἐχθροὺς) and active hostility (πολεμίους), slaying and injuring us just as you Gentiles do." (1) There may be a reference to the Bar-Cochba war in which the Christians of Palestine died by Jewish hands as "martyrs to their loyalty to the empire" which was itself persecuting them. (2) The contrast may be quite general—on the one side the persecution of a resentful world (it is Greek society, not Roman government, that is mentioned as persecuting), on the other

the Greeks persecute them; and yet they that hate them can state no ground for their enmity.[1]

VI. In a word, what the soul is in the body Christians are in the world. 2. The soul is spread through all the members of the body; so are Christians through all the cities of the world. 3. The soul dwells in the body, and yet it is not of the body; so Christians dwell in the world, and yet they are not of the world. 4. The soul, itself invisible, is detained in a body which is visible; so Christians are recognized as being in the world, but their religious life remains invisible.[2] 5. The flesh hates the soul, and fights against it, though

---

the antagonism of Judaism to the new Jewish faith that had broken with its national traditions. The word "alien" suggests that the nationalists of Palestine hated the Hebrew Christians as renegades, and so worse than mere foreigners.

[1] Besides the hatred which knew its own reasons—the hatred of the Jew for believers in the Christhood of the Nazarene, and the hatred of the pagan for the scorners of his gods—there was the hatred of the world, Jewish and pagan alike, for the Christianity which rebuked its ways; and this was a hatred which could not or would not give an account of itself.

[2] See Introd. pp. 48, 49. Funk thinks there is a contrast here between the externalism of pagan and Jewish sacrifice and ritual, and the spirituality of Christian worship. But (1) Christian worship was not invisible; it had its simple rites and ceremonies, as Pliny found in his province in A.D. 112; (2) it is the Christian life that is here in question, the spiritual power in the individual and in the Church.

suffering no wrong, because it is prevented by the soul from indulging in its pleasures; so too the world, though suffering no wrong, hates the Christians because they set themselves against its pleasures. 6. The soul loves the flesh that hates it, and the members thereof; so Christians love them that hate them. 7. The soul is enclosed within the body, and itself holds the body together; so too Christians are held fast in the world as in a prison, and yet it is they who hold the world together.[1] 8. Immortal itself, the soul abides in a mortal tenement;[2] Christians dwell for a time amid corruptible things, awaiting their incorruption in heaven. 9. The soul when it is stinted of food and drink thrives the better; so Christians when

[1] Justin (*Apol.* ii. 7) speaks of God as delaying the end of the world for the sake of "the holy seed of the Christians." Cp. Clement Alex., *Quis Dives*, c. 36: "All things are held together so long as the seed remains here, and when it is gathered in, these shall very quickly be dissolved." But most suggestive of all is the Syriac version of Aristides (c. 16): "I have no doubt that the world stands by reason of the intercession of the Christians."

[2] Lit. "tabernacle," "tent," σκήνωμα, used of the body in *Wisdom of Solomon*, ix. 15. The words "prison" (φρουρὰ) in § 7, and "detained" (φρουρεῖται) in § 4, recall Plato's reference in the *Phædo* (p. 62 B.) to the saying "that we men are in a sort of prison, and a man must not set himself free therefrom nor run away" (cp. § 10 of this chapter). But 2 Cor. v. 1–4 and 2 Pet. i. 13, 14 are the obvious sources of much of this description of the soul in the body.

they are punished increase daily all the more.[1] 10. So great is the position to which God has appointed them, and which it is not lawful for them to refuse.

VII. For[2] this is no earthly discovery, as I said, which was delivered into their charge; it is no mortal idea which they regard themselves bound so diligently to guard; it is no stewardship of merely human mysteries with which they have been entrusted. 2. But God Himself in very truth, the almighty and all-creating and invisible God, Himself from heaven planted among men and established in their hearts the Truth and the Word, the holy, incomprehensible Word,[3] sending to

[1] Otto takes the word "increase" (πλεονάζουσι) of the *qualitative* increase, *i. e.* the growing strength of Christian character and influence under persecution. The parallel between the soul and the Church is perhaps in favour of this idea. But in chapter vii, § 8, the context is decisive in favour of the *quantitative* meaning of this same word, *i. e.* the recruiting of the numbers of the Christian community. Cp. Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 50: "We multiply as often as we are mown down by you; the blood of Christians is like a seed."

[2] This unique character is the fruit of an unique creed. The Christian life is more than human in its manifestation because the Christian faith is divine in its origin.

[3] The term *logos* is hard to define in this sentence. Three renderings are possible: (*a*) *reason*, the faculty of reason (thought, language) with which God endowed man at his creation (cp. chapter x, § 2), "To whom (men) God gave reason and intelligence" (λόγος and νοῦς); (*b*) *teaching*, the revelation of truth in Christ, as Lightfoot-Harmer translates, "Planted

men not a servant,[1] as one might imagine, or an angel or ruler, or one of those who administer earthly things, or of those who have been entrusted with the ordering of things in heaven, but the very Artificer and Creator of the universe Himself, by whom He made the heavens, by whom He enclosed the sea within bounds of its own, whose mysteries[2]

---

among men the truth, and the holy teaching which passeth the wit of man, and fixed it firmly in their hearts, not by sending a subaltern or angel . . . but by sending the Artificer and Creator Himself"; (*c*) *the Word*, the Incarnation of the personal Logos. (*a*) is obviously inadequate here; (*b*) is favoured perhaps by the words of the context, "planted," "established"; (*c*) is suggested by the epithets "holy" and "incomprehensible" (ἀπερινόητος, used by Chrysostom of God). Perhaps it is neither necessary nor possible to separate (*b*) and (*c*). The reference is in either case to the Incarnation. S. John represents our Lord as calling Himself "the truth" and yet as speaking of His own word (λόγος). The writer of this Epistle may have had both ideas in his mind, and not tried to distinguish between the revelation and the Revealer.

[1] Otto takes "servant" as a general term subsequently divided into (*a*) "angels" administering on earth, and (*b*) "rulers" governing in heaven. On the subject of these spiritual agents or powers see especially Lightfoot on Col. i. 16, and Armitage Robinson on Eph. i. 21, and also pp. 20 foll. of his introductory exposition of that epistle.

[2] The term "mysteries" here refers to what are called the laws of nature. They are mysteries as being unfathomed by human intellect (Böhl); they are His mysteries as being not impersonal tendencies but the secret counsels of the living Word.

all the elements[1] faithfully observe, from whom the sun has received the measure of his daily courses to keep, whom the moon obeys as He bids her shine at night, whom the stars obey as they follow the course of the moon, by whom all things have been ordered and defined and placed in subjection,[2] the heavens and things in the heavens, the earth and things in the earth, the sea and things in the sea, fire, air, abyss, things in the heights above, things in the depths beneath, things in the space between—He it was whom God sent to men. 3. Did He send Him, as a man might think, on a mission of domination and fear and terror? 4. Indeed He did not, but in gentleness and meekness He sent Him, as a king sending his own son who is himself a king;[3] He sent Him as God, He sent

[1] Gk. στοιχεῖα, (*a*) originally, the letters of the alphabet; (*b*) elements of instruction, rudiments (Heb. v. 12, perhaps also Gal. iv. 3); (*c*) the physical elements (2 Pet. iii. 10, 12), either earth, fire, etc., or the heavenly bodies, sun, moon and stars, or in particular the twelve signs of the zodiac. Here no doubt it is used in the general sense of (*c*).

[2] In subjection (*a*) to man (cp. x. 2), or more probably (*b*) to God. The reference in either case is to the original subordination of the created universe, not to the yet unrealized assertion of the supremacy of Christ over a disordered world (as in 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28). The two ideas are blended in Heb. ii. 5–9. (*c*) The Greek would just bear the translation: "And to whom (*i.e.* the Word) all things have been subjected;" but the change of construction is forced.

[3] Introd. p. 18.

Him as man to men, He sent Him with the idea of saving, of persuading, not of forcing; for force is no part of the nature of God.[1] 5. He sent Him as inviting, not as pursuing man; He sent Him in love, not in judgment. 6. For He will send Him in judgment; and who shall stand before His presence? . . . 7. (Dost thou not see them)[2] flung to the wild beasts, to make them deny their Lord, and yet unconquered? 8. Dost thou not see that the more of them are punished the more their numbers increase? 9. These things look not like the achievements of man; they are the power of God; they are the proofs of His presence.[3]

[1] The same idea occurs in almost the same words in Irenæus, iv. 37, 1: "Force is no part of God's nature, but a kindly purpose is ever present with Him." Funk compares Orig. *Sel. in Ps.* (ed. Bened.) ii. 556: "Christ conquers no man against his will, but by persuading him."

[2] *Cod. Argent.* had a blank space here which Sylburg proposed to fill thus: "And as those who have believed on Him expect His coming without a doubt, there is nothing that can daunt or subdue them. Seest thou not how they are flung?" etc. The words are pure conjecture, but they probably represent the missing line of thought.

[3] *Cod. Argent.* had *dogmata*, "doctrines," silently altered by Stephanus to *deigmata*, "signs," "proofs," and no doubt rightly. The "presence" (Gk. *parousia*) may be (*a*) the second coming of Christ, as in § 6, and this possible example of the lingering expectation of His speedy return has been pressed as an indication of an early date for the Epistle; (*b*) His first coming, *i. e.* "proofs of the mission of the Son, not a mere man"; but probably it is (*c*) the presence of the Lord

VIII. Who among men understood at all what God is, before He came?[1] 2. Or dost thou accept the vain and foolish theories of those famous philosophers,[2] of whom some said that God was fire (giving the name of God to the element into which they themselves are destined to go), and others that He was water, and others again some other of the elements created by God? 3. And indeed if any one of these theories deserves acceptance, each of the remaining creatures might just as readily be proved to be God. 4. But these notions are but the trickery and imposture of magicians. 5. No man ever saw[3] God or made Him known;[4] God

---

vouchsafed to the martyr as really if not as wonderfully as to S. Stephen. The strength of the martyr witnessed to his consciousness of the nearness of his Saviour as truly as it was sustained by his belief in a future judgment (ch. x, § 8).

[1] There is no need to suspect here the Sabellianism which regarded the Son merely as a mode of manifestation of the one God. The Son is evidently to our author a distinct person, but so truly God that when He came God came.

[2] The irony in "famous" is patent. Cp. (? Justin) *Cohort. ad Græc.*, iv. 5, B, C: "See now the discord between those who are considered among you to have been wise men . . . some declaring that water was the source of all things, others air, others fire, others again some other of the said elements, and all of them using plausible arguments of a sort," etc.

[3] Εἶδεν, an almost certain correction of the *Cod. Argent.* εἶπεν, "declared."

[4] Lightfoot-Harmer, "recognized." But though in classical

revealed Himself. 6. And He revealed Himself through faith, to[1] which alone it has been granted to see God. 7. For God, the Lord and Creator of the universe, who made all things, and set them in order, proved to be not only loving unto man but also longsuffering. 8. Such indeed He ever was and is and will be, kind and good and dispassionate and true—in fact He alone is good.[2] 9. But He conceived a great and unspeakable thought, and this He communicated to His Son alone. 10. While therefore He kept and guarded His wise counsel as a mystery, He seemed indeed to be negligent and careless of us.[3] 11. But when He

---

Gk. the verb *γνωρίζω* mostly = "know," in N. T. it is only once "know" (Phil. i. 22), and twenty-four times it is "make known."

[1] Or, "by which."

[2] Hoffmann, objecting to the repetition of "good" (Gk. *agathos*) conjectured *aganos*, "gentle." But the repetition is not mere repetition. First, goodness is predicated as an attribute of God; then God is declared to be the only source of goodness (cp. Matt. xix. 17,; Mk. x. 18; Lk. xviii. 19). On the idea of "the good God" see Introd. pp. 23–25.

[3] For the eternity of this purpose, see Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 1 Cor. ii. 7–10; Gal. iv. 4, 5; Eph. iii. 4–10; Col. i. 26, 27. For God's seeming "negligence" of man's sin in past times, see Rom. iii. 25; Heb. ix. 15; and especially Acts xvii. 30. The whole passage here is Pauline in its ideas.

Cod. Argent. had a marginal comment at this point: "The mystery of the Holy Trinity was hidden for such long periods of time until the baptism in Jordan." But the mystery in

revealed it through His beloved Son, and made manifest what had been prepared from the beginning, then He bestowed upon us all things at once—to partake of His benefits, and to see and understand[1] things which none of us could ever have expected.

IX. Having therefore planned the whole dispensation already[2] in His own mind in union with

---

question is not the revelation of the Trinity, it is the purpose of redemption. There is no direct Trinitarian teaching in this Epistle; even its teaching on the relation of the Son to the Father comes incidentally in the course of the exposition of the great facts of the Incarnation and the Atonement. Kihn (*op. cit.*, pp. 42, 43) suggests that this note may have come from a scribe of the date and school of Theodore of Mopsuestia, on the ground that it was Theodore who laid stress upon the baptism as the first revelation of God as the Father. It is an unsupported conjecture. But no doubt the comment belongs to the later days of Trinitarian controversy as certainly as the Epistle belongs to the earlier days when the second Person was the great theme of doctrinal investigation.

[1] Gk. *νοῆσαι*, Lachmann's conjecture for the *Cod. Argent.* *ποιῆσαι*, "to do." If the latter represents the original text correctly we have in the coupling of "seeing" and "doing" a parallel to the "grace" and "truth" of Joh. i. 17 (cp. Collect for 1st S. after Epiphany).

[2] Lachmann's conjecture *πάντ' οὖν ἤδη . . . οἰκονομηκώς*. The *Cod. Argent.* had *πάντ' οὖν ἤδει . . . οἰκονομικῶς*, lit. "economically," which could only be taken as an astonishingly early instance of a use not infrequent in fathers of the fourth and later centuries, who used this word like *οἰκονομία*, "economy," either to describe the Incarnation as a dispensation of God, or to express the reservation with which Christ

the Son, He permitted us during the former time to be carried along by disorderly inclinations just as we wished, and led astray by pleasures and desires, not in any way taking delight in our sins, but bearing with them, nor again assenting to that age of unrighteousness, but creating all the while the present age of righteousness,[1] so that we, having then been by our own works convicted of our unworthiness of life, might now be rendered worthy by the goodness of God, and having plainly proved that we were unable of ourselves to enter into the kingdom of God, might be enabled so to enter by the power of God. 2. But when our unrighteousness had now been fulfilled, when it had been made completely manifest, that its

---

spoke of certain things in the language and according to the knowledge of His hearers. The text of *Cod. Argent.* must thus mean either (*a*) that God shared all knowledge of His purpose with His Son, in virtue of the intimate relations subsisting within the Godhead ; or (*b*) God knew all, but kept the knowledge to Himself with the Son, in accordance with His plan of revelation, *i. e.* to keep back the knowledge until man was ready to receive and accept it. The latter is more in accordance with the context. But Lachmann's conjecture gives a simpler meaning still.

[1] *Cod. Argent.* had *νοῦν*, "developing slowly the mind (or sense) of righteousness." Hefele conjectured *τὸν νῦν* (*i. e.* *καιρὸν*), *i. e.* "the present (age) of righteousness," in contrast to "that age of unrighteousness." Another less probable conjecture is *νόμον*, "the law of righteousness" (cp. Rom. ix. 31).

retribution was awaited in chastisement and death, when the time came which God had ordained to manifest His own goodness and power (O the surpassing kindness and love of God for man!),[1] He did not hate us or reject us or take vengeance upon us, but showed His longsuffering and forbearance; in His mercy[2] He Himself took up the burden of our sins, He Himself gave His own Son as a ransom on our behalf, the holy for the lawless, the innocent for the guilty, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal.

3. What else could cover our sins but His righteousness? 4. In whom could we lawless and ungodly men be justified but in the Son of God alone? 5. O sweet exchange! O inscrutable operation! O unexpected blessings, that the lawlessness of many should be hidden in one righteous person, and the righteousness of one should justify the lawless many! 6. Having there-

[1] The text of *Cod. Argent.* might be rendered "How (for) the love of God is one in its surpassing kindness to man!" By "one" is meant either (*a*) unique, alone in its greatness, or (*b*) ever one and the same, consistently active, even when it seemed neglectful of man.

[2] *Cod. Argent.* had λέγων, "saying," an unintelligible reading. Hefele proposed to cut it out as an interpolation from a marginal note calling attention to the reference to Isaiah liii. 4, 11. Lachmann conjectured ἐλεῶν, lit. "being merciful."

fore proved in the former time the powerlessness of our nature to win life, and having now revealed a Saviour powerful to save even the powerless, in both these ways He wished us to believe His goodness, to regard Him as guardian,[1] father, teacher, counsellor, physician, mind, light, honour, glory, strength, life, and not to be anxious about clothing and food.[2]

X. If thou, too, desirest this faith, first obtain the knowledge of the Father.[3] 2. For God loved

[1] Gk. *τροφέα*, lit. "nurse" (masc.); cp. *Baruch*, iv. 8, "Ye forgot the God that nursed you" (*τροφεύσαντα*), and the compound *τροφοφορεῖν* used in the LXX of Deut. i. 31, and 2 Macc. vii. 27, and in the A. V. and R. V. (margin) of Acts xiii. 18, "He bare them (Israel) as a nursing father in the wilderness."

[2] Otto suspected that the clause after "life" was a gloss added to the text. But they are not the feeble anti-climax that he thought them to be. Providence and Atonement come together in the Lord's Prayer—the daily bread and the forgiveness of sin. The Atonement is the crowning revelation of a love that supplies all the needs and enters into all the details of man's life; cp. especially Rom. viii. 32, "He that spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?"

[3] *Cod. Argent.*, followed by Funk, "and obtainest first the knowledge," etc., a second conditional sentence, the apodosis or principal sentence being lost in the digression of § 2 on the Father's love, or perhaps coming eventually in the shape of a fresh beginning with § 3. Lachmann's conjecture, "mayest thou then obtain," makes the clause a wish or a prayer; Gebhardt's, "then first obtain," an imperative. The martyrs' "faith" can only be won by those who will learn the martyrs' creed. If "this faith" means the body of Christian

men, for whose sake He made the world, to whom He subjected all things that are in the earth, to whom He gave reason and intelligence, to whom alone He granted to look upward to Him,[1] whom He formed after His own image, to whom He sent His only-begotten Son, to whom He promised the kingdom that is in heaven, yea, and will give it to them that have loved Him. 3. And when thou hast attained this knowledge,[2] with what joy, thinkest thou, wilt thou be filled? Or how wilt thou love Him who so first loved thee? 4. Loving Him, thou wilt be an imitator of His goodness. Wonder not that man can be an imitator of God; by the will of God he can. 5. For happiness consists not in exercising lordship over a neighbour, nor in wishing to have advantage of weaker men, nor in possessing wealth and using force against inferiors. Not in ways like these can a man imitate God; such ways are far removed

---

belief it is instructive to note: (1) that the knowledge of the Father is its first lesson; (2) that this knowledge, as set forth in § 2, practically means creation, redemption, sanctification, all regarded as the expression of the love of God; (3) that God is, however, "the Father," not explicitly "our Father."

[1] "Upward" (ἄνω) is Beurer's conjecture; *Cod. Argent.* has only the letter ἀ . . . For "Him" (αὐτὸν) Lachmann conjectured "heaven" (οὐνον, contraction of οὐρανόν).

[2] *i.e.* of the Father and His love for man seen in the Incarnation and the Atonement.

from His majesty.[1] 6. But whosoever takes up his neighbour's burden, whosoever is willing to use his superiority as a means of benefiting another man who is in this respect his inferior, whosoever bestows upon the needy what he himself holds as a recipient of God's bounty and so becomes a god[2] to the recipients of his bounty, he

[1] Gk. μεγαλειότης, the word used in Lk. ix. 43, of the majesty of God shown in the healing of the demoniac boy; in 2 Pet. i. 16, of the majesty of the transfigured Christ on the mount. The majesty of God is a majesty of love and of holiness.

[2] Stephanus compared this to the Greek proverb ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπου δαιμόνιον, lit. a man's good genius, used of a man coming as we say providentially to a man's rescue. Funk (*Theol. Quart.*, 1881, pp. 146–148) rightly points out that a higher and truer parallel is to be found in a proverb quoted in Erasmus' *Philodoxus*: "Deum esse quisquis juvat mortalem," which sees something divine in all benevolence. Kihn (*Theol. Quart.*, 1902, pp. 495–498) produces a closer parallel yet in Hippolytus, *Philos.* x. 34, where true knowledge is represented as making man immortal like God, and as leading man to become good by imitating the goodness of God. This parallel goes only a little way towards proving that our author knew Hippolytus or was Hippolytus, for it is obvious that the source of this idea of philanthropy as a form of godliness and a fruit of faith, is S. John, *e.g.* John xiii. 34; 1 John iii. 16, 17 and iv. 21. Funk quotes a saying from Gregory Naz., *Orat.* xiv. 26, 27, which is either a reminiscence of our author or a close coincidence: "Be thou a god to him that is in distress, imitating so the mercy of God; for man has nothing which is so truly of the nature of God as the doing of good."

is an imitator of God. 7. Then though thou art yet upon earth thou shalt behold that God ruleth in heaven, then shalt thou begin to speak the mysteries of God,[1] then shalt thou love and admire them that are punished for their refusal to deny God, then shalt thou pass judgment upon the deception and delusion of the world, when thou hast learned to know the true life that is in heaven, to despise the seeming death here, and to fear the real death there, which is reserved for them that shall be condemned to the eternal fire which shall punish them that are delivered over unto it, even unto the end. Then shalt thou admire them that endure for righteousness' sake the fire that lasteth but for a time, when thou hast learned to know that fire yonder. . . .

XI. It is no strange message that I preach, no unreasonable argument that I pursue ;[2] but having been a disciple of the apostles,[3] I am now become a teacher of the nations, and what was once

[1] Here is the complement of the first part of this chapter. There a life of goodness is described as the outcome of the true knowledge of God ; here true knowledge is the outcome of a life of goodness. Love and faith react upon each other.

[2] *Cod. Argent.* ζητῶ. Bunsen conjectured ζηλῶ, "nor am I irrational in my zeal."

[3] Not necessarily a personal pupil, as Polycarp was of S. John, but an indirect disciple, a follower of apostolical tradition. So the baptismal creed is called "the apostles' creed," as representing the teaching of the apostles, not as being their composition.

delivered unto me I now minister rightly [1] in my turn to those who become disciples of the truth. 2. For who that has been duly instructed and has become the friend of the Word [2] does not seek to learn exactly the things that were shown plainly by the Word to the disciples, to whom the Word manifested these things on His own appearance in the world, speaking openly, not understood indeed by the unbelieving, but explaining things [3] to the disciples, who, being counted faithful by Him, learned the mysteries of the Father? 3. For this cause He sent the Word, that He might appear unto the world, the Word who was dishonoured by the chosen people, proclaimed by the apostles, and believed on by the nations.[4] 4. This is He who

[1] *Cod. Argent.* ἀξίοις, agreeing with "disciples," "who become worthy disciples of the truth." But the conjecture ἀξίως, "worthily," "rightly," is probably correct. The emphasis of the paragraph is not on the fitness of the disciple, but on the fidelity of the teacher.

[2] *Cod. Argent.* had λόγῳ προσφιλεῖ γεννηθείς, "begotten by the loving Word." Stephanus conjectured γενηθείς, Prud. M. προσφιλής, lit. "become dear to the Word," or perhaps "kindly-disposed."

[3] *Cod. Argent.* διηγούμενος (mid.) = "explaining." Lachmann conjectured διηχούμενος (pass.) lit. "made to resound." Bunsen, "published by the disciples"; but the Greek word here suggested is rare, and the idea premature. The preaching of apostles comes in the next sentence; here it is the training of the disciples that is being described.

[4] Cp. 1 Tim. iii. 16, perhaps a fragment of a familiar hymn or confession of faith (so, too, Eph. v. 14), see Ellicott, *ad loc.*

was from the beginning, who appeared as new and was found to be ancient, and is ever being born anew in the hearts of the saints.[1] 5. This is He who is the eternal, who has been in this our day accounted a Son,[2] through whom the Church is enriched, and grace unfolding[3] increases among the saints, grace which gives understanding, reveals mysteries, proclaims seasons,[4] rejoices over the

---

Probst (*Lehre u. Gebet in d. drei ersten chr. Jahrh.*, pp. 268, 270, 281) suggests a similar origin for parts of this epistle (ch. vii, §§ 4-6 ; ch. ix, § 2 : " He did not hate . . . ." to the end ; ch. xi, §§ 3-6) on the ground of their rhythmical and antithetical wording.

[1] "Appeared as new," καινός, new in character ; "born anew," νέος, new in time. The Son is καινὸς in the historical Incarnation ; it was a new departure in God's ways with men. He is νέος in the spiritual life of His people ; there He is in a sense incarnate afresh from age to age. Cp. Gal. iv. 20, and the Collect for Christmas Day.

[2] Ps. ii. 7, quoted by S. Paul at Antioch (Acts xiii. 33), as fulfilled in the Resurrection of Christ (cp. Rom. i. 4). It is one of the proper psalms for Easter Day. Was this fragment of a homily an Easter sermon? Cp. chapter xii, § 9 : "the Lord's passover advances." "To-day" would be a vivid touch if it meant the anniversary of His vindication as the Son of God.

[3] Bunsen translates "simple," "that simple grace which gives," etc. But the verb in classical and patristic Greek, as in the Septuagint = "unfold," "extend." Here it refers (1) to the development of the *revelation* of the grace of Christ ; or (2) to the extension of the *influence* of that grace.

[4] Bunsen (*Hippolytus and his Age*, i. 415) interprets this of the guidance of the Church by the Spirit, in dealing with

faithful, and is bestowed upon those who seek, who break not the pledges of faith,[1] nor trespass beyond the bounds set by the fathers.[2] 6. Then the fear of the law is sung,[3] and the grace of the prophets[4] is recognized, and the faith of the gospels[5] is established, and the tradition of the apostles is preserved, and the grace of the Church is joyous

---

the vexed question of the date of Easter, and refers to chapter xii, § 9, where "the Lord's passover" and the "seasons" are mentioned together.

[1] *Cod. Argent.* had ὅρια, "bounds," as in the next clause. Lachmann conjectured ὅρκια, lit. oaths, *i. e.* the baptismal vows, the pledges of a Christian profession.

[2] *i. e.* the limits marked by apostolic tradition in doctrine and discipline. Funk compares Jerome, ep. 63, *ad Theoph.*, c. 2, "nobis nihil est antiquius quam Christi jura servare nec *patrum transferre* (v. l. transire) *terminos*." This early use of ὅρια in such a sense may be compared with the later use of ὅρος to denote the formal "decrees of the fathers," *i. e.* the bishops and teachers of the Church assembled in synod or council.

[3] *i. e.* (1) is chanted in psalm or hymn; or (2) is praised in lection or sermon. See Introd. pp. 33, 42. Cp. Justin's reference to the reading of the prophets, as well as of the memoirs of the apostles, in the weekly services of the Church (*Apol.* i. 67). Westcott translates "the fearful strains of the Law are repeated" (*Intr. to Study of Gospels*, p. 421).

[4] *i. e.* the grace by which the prophets were enlightened—in modern language, the reality of their inspiration.

[5] Gebhardt conjectured "evangelists," instead of the "evangel" of the *Cod. Argent.* But this would destroy the symmetry of the text. Law and prophets correspond to gospels and apostles respectively.

and strong.[1] 7. If thou grieve not this grace,[2] thou shalt understand the truths which the Word preaches by whom He chooses, when He wills. 8. For what we were moved to declare with much labour by the will of the Word commanding us, we impart unto you out of love for what has been revealed unto us.[3]

XII. Meeting with[4] these truths, and listening to them earnestly, ye will know all that God bestows upon them that love Him aright, ye who become thereby a very paradise of delight, producing in your midst[5] a fruitful tree of abundant

[1] Lit. "leaps" like a young animal, "exults." For this χάρις of the *Cod. Argent.*, the "grace" or spiritual life of the Church, Lachmann conjectured χαρά, "joy," which Bunsen translates "the Church leaps for joy." But the text gives a richer thought.

[2] See Introd. pp. 41, 42, on the relation of this grace to the Holy Spirit, and on the relation of Church teaching to Christ as the Teacher.

[3] Two motives combine to make the Christian teach: one is obedience to Christ's command, the other is the love of the truth itself.

[4] Lightfoot-Harmer, "confronted with." The Greek word =(1) to come across; (2) to read. It might be used of the hearer of a sermon, or the reader of a homily. The sense "reading" would not be inconsistent with "listening"; at the end of chapter i "speak" and "hear" are used of writer and reader.

[5] *i. e.* in the life of the Church; or "growing up in yourselves," *i. e.* in your own spiritual life. The Church is a paradise of grace and truth; so, too, is the heart of the believer.

growth adorned with fruits of rich variety. 2. For in this ground[1] hath been planted a tree of knowledge and a tree of life; but it is not the tree of knowledge that destroys, it is disobedience that destroys. 3. Not without significance is that which is written,[2] how God planted from the beginning a tree (of knowledge and a tree)[3] of life in the midst of the garden, indicating thereby life through knowledge;[4] and it was through not using this knowledge in purity[5] that the first human beings were left naked[6] by the deception of the serpent. 4. There is no life without

[1] *i. e.* in this paradise of the Church or the heart.

[2] Lightfoot-Harmer, "the Scriptures state clearly." But the idea is rather that there is an allegorical truth beneath the simple narrative.

[3] Bunsen added these words. They are plainly required by the context (cp. § 2), and might easily be omitted through the scribe's eye passing rapidly to the second word "tree."

[4] *i. e.* (1) indicating by this allegory that life is to be won through knowledge; or (2) revealing the true meaning of life to our first parents by the knowledge that He gave them.

[5] There may be a reference here to the Gnostic idea that the first sin was the physical intercourse of Adam and Eve, as a thing evil either in itself, or (as Clem. Alex. thought) in its premature use. But the purity here contemplated is more probably the moral purity of "loyal singleness of heart." Lightfoot-Harmer, "genuinely"; Bunsen, "rightly"; *Ante-Nic. Chr. Libr.*, "properly."

[6] Bunsen, "deprived" of true knowledge, or of the life they might have had.

knowledge, nor is there sound knowledge[1] without true life; wherefore the two trees are planted the one beside the other. 5. And the Apostle, observing the force of this (conjunction),[2] and blaming the knowledge that is practised apart from the truth of the commandment that leadeth unto life,[3] saith, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth." 6. For he who thinks that he knows aught without the true knowledge which is testified by life has learned nothing; he is led astray by the serpent, not having loved the real life. But he who has

[1] The word may mean (*a*) safe—knowledge divorced from religion is a moral danger; or (*b*) secure—only the knowledge that is loyal to God has the secret of growth; or (*c*) sound—knowledge without religion is neglecting an essential factor of life. Life is here the life of communion with God. It finds expression in conduct among men, but it is here regarded in its source and spring.

[2] *i. e.* of this conjunction of the two trees, namely, knowledge and life.

[3] There are two possible constructions of this sentence. (*a*) "Unto life" may belong to "the commandment of truth," as it is taken above; the sense is then, "apart from the moral truth (the truth embodied in the commandment of God), which results in the true life of love for God and man." (*b*) "Unto life" may belong to "practised." So Bunsen translates, "knowledge when applied to life without the command of truth"; and the translator in *Ante-Nic. Chr. Libr.*, "knowledge, when admitted to influence life without the true doctrine." This construction might be better rendered thus: "the knowledge which aims at life (*i.e.* tries to work out its own selfish idea of life), apart from the law of moral truth."

acquired his knowledge with fear, and seeks after life, plants in hope, expecting fruit. 7. Let thy heart be knowledge, and let thy life be the true word understood in thy heart.[1] 8. Bearing the tree thereof and taking[2] its fruit, thou shalt ever reap[3] the harvest that is desired[4] in the sight of God, which the serpent toucheth not, and deception cometh not near to defile;[5] and Eve is not

[1] Lightfoot-Harmer, "true reason duly comprehended," *χωρούμενος*. The word is used transit. in Matt. xix. 11, 12 = to receive a difficult saying, and intransit. in John viii. 37 (A. V.), "My word hath no place in you"; (R. V.) "hath not free course." These passages are in favour of "word," as against "reason," as the translation of *logos* in the text above. Knowledge must bear fruit in life, and life must be based on knowledge. Westcott (*Canon of N. T.*, p. 91) paraphrases the saying thus: "In other words, Christian wisdom must be the spring of action, and Christian life the realization of truth."

[2] *Cod. Argent.* had only the last three letters of a word here. Otto conjectured "taking"; Beurer "loving"; Bunsen "finding room for"; Sylburg "bringing to perfection."

[3] Bunsen, by a change of one letter, would read: "shall fare sumptuously upon."

[4] Beurer conjectured "provided"; Bunsen "abounding."

[5] Gk. *συγχρωτίζεται*, a word belonging to a group which express (1) contact of skin; (2) colouring of the surface touched; (3) defilement. If Otto is right in reading "deceit" as a dative case, we might render the clause (*a*) "neither are they (the fruits of knowledge) stained with deceit"; or (*b*) "and Eve is not defiled with deceit, nor is she corrupted, but," etc.; or (*c*) with Bunsen, "and Eve will not come near to seduce thee, nor will she be corrupted." Bunsen's

corrupted, but is trusted in her maiden purity.[1] 9. And salvation[2] is set forth plainly, and the apostles are interpreted,[3] and the Lord's passover

---

rendering gives an exact parallel to the Fall-story of Eve as both deceived and deceiving. But it does violence to the order of the Greek.

[1] The idea of the writer is clearly that the true knowledge is the antithesis of the Fall. But it is not clear whether Eve is here the Eve of Genesis or "the second Eve," the Blessed Virgin (cp. Justin, *Dial.* c. 100; Irenæus, iii. 32–4). In the former case the idea seems to be that Eve can be safely trusted, being untouched by the serpent—an allegory signifying that man's perceptive faculty (αἴσθησις) need not be suspected as though it were itself corrupted by pleasure (ἡδονή), and so in turn were corrupting the purity of his knowledge. In the latter case the antithesis is between the disobedience of Eve through listening to the serpent, and the obedience of the Virgin to the angel's message; it is an allusion to the Virgin Birth.

[2] The Greek word σωτήριον is frequent in Septuagint = (1) safety, salvation; (2) peace-offering. Is it possible that here it is the Christian peace-offering of an Easter Eucharist? See p. 82, n. 2 and 4, and p. 89, n. 1 and 2. Otherwise it must be a general expression for the preaching of the Gospel, the free offer of salvation.

[3] συνετίζονται, *i. e.* (*a*) the teaching of the apostles is recited and explained; or (*b*) the writings of the apostles are read and explained. Cp. Justin's reference to the reading of the "memoirs of the apostles" at the Sunday Eucharist. Lightfoot-Harmer translates "are filled with understanding"; but though the Greek verb is used more frequently in Septuagint of *instructing* than of *interpreting*, it is hard to see in what sense the writer could speak of the apostles as being filled with understanding at the present time, when the apostles

advances on its way,[1] and the seasons[2] are kept and are arranged in order,[3] and the Word rejoices to teach the saints, the Word through whom the Father is glorified, to whom be the glory for ever. Amen.[4]

---

were long dead, unless the name apostle is to be supposed here to have the same sense as it has in the *Didache*, viz. a missionary order of ministry existing like the prophets alongside the settled ministry of bishops and presbyters.

[1] *i. e.* "the Easter service proceeds in due course"; or "the Christian passover goes on from age to age." Otto thinks that the reference is to the numbers of catechumens baptized on Easter Eve, and proceeding to the reception of the Easter Eucharist.

[2] *Cod. Argent.* κηροί, Lat. *cerei*, wax tapers, "the lights are gathered together" for the early Easter-day service. Conjecture has been busy here. Lachmann suggested πηροί, "the lame are gathered" to receive Christian charity; Prud. M. and Hefele χοροί, "choirs"; Bunsen κλῆροι, "congregations"; Sylburg καιροί, "seasons," *i. e.* the different festivals of the Christian year are brought into connexion, or follow each other in close succession.

[3] Bunsen, "and [all things] are arranged in order." For the words "in order" (μετὰ κόσμου) Credner suggested μετακόσμια, *i. e.* things relating to the world beyond are explained. But μετακόσμια is a technical term of Greek philosophy = the spaces between the bodies of the universe (Lat. *intermundia*), and introduces an idea foreign to the context here.

[4] Harnack (*Chron.* ii. 2, p. 232) quotes as a striking parallel this clause from the close of Hippolytus, *de Antichristo*: "In which hope (the Word) having raised up the saints will rejoice with them in glorifying the Father, to whom be glory for ever. Amen." It should be noted, however, that this

refers to the joy of the Lord and His servants in the resurrection life. In our text it is the communion of Master and disciple in the possession of divine truth. Cp. Westcott (*Canon of N. T.*, p. 89): "The sense of personal intercourse with the Word was fresh and deep. Revelation was not then wholly a thing of the past."

GENERAL INDEX

ACHILLES TATIUS, 13
Aelius L., 19
Alexandrian school, 31, 34, 36
Ambrosius, 31 *n.*
Angels, 57, 60, 69
Antoninus P., 17, 19
Apelles, 24
Apollos, 21
Apologists, 11, 12, 27, 28, 42
Apostles, 80, 81, 83, 88
Argentoratensis, Codex, 7, 9, 10, 22, 32, 55, 58, 59, 61, 64, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 89
Aristides, 12, 26, 27, 29, 52, 53, 57, 60, 67
Athenagoras, 8
Atonement, 40, 41, 45, 75–77
Aurelius, M., 17, 19, 44

BARATIER, 21
Bar-Cochba, 18, 47, 65
Bardenhewer, 32
Basil, 13
Baur, 51
Bethune-Baker, 39, 41, 42
Beurer, 8, 9, 62, 87
Bibliotheca of Photius, 13, 14
Birks, E. B., 31 *n.*
Böhl, 9, 55, 69
Bonwetsch, 35
Bunsen, 9, 18, 22, 35, 55, 63, 64, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89

CHRISTIAN *gnosis*, 37, 44, 87
Christian seasons, 82, 89
Christianity, 16, 17, 28, 43, 48–51
Christians, 18, 43, 45, 48–51, 52, 56, 60–68
Christology, 20, 25, 38–42
Church, 32, 33, 35, 36, 41, 42, 82, 83
Church Quarterly Review, 12
Circumcision, 59
Clement of Rome, 13, 21
Clement of Alexandria, 12, 29, 36, 67, 85
Codex Argentoratensis, s.v. *Argentoratensis*
Codex, Tübing., 9, 32
„ *Leyden.*, 9
Cotterill, J. M., 12-15
Credner, 89
Crusius, M., 9
Cunitz, 9

Didache, 89
Diognetus, 18, 26, 33, 43, 44, 53
Dionysius Areop., 44
Dobschütz, Von, 30
Donaldson, 10, 11
Dorner, 21, 25

Doulcet, 26, 44
Dräseke, 11, 12, 24, 35
Drummond, R. B., 12

EASTER, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89
Eucharist, 88, 89
Eusebius, 16, 63
Eve, 87, 88
Expansion of Christianity (Harnack), 49, 50, 52, 53

FALL, the, 34, 87, 88
Fasts and feasts, 59, 60
Funk, 10, 61, 66, 79

GALEN, 13
Gallandi, 8, 21
Gebhardt, 9, 77, 83
Genesis, 34, 36, 85, 87, 88
Ghost, the Holy, 20, 41
Gnosis, Christian, 25, 32, 37, 44, 87
Gnosticism, 20, 24, 25, 85
Goodness of God, 23, 25, 73
Grace, 41, 83, 84
Greek philosophy, 11, 44, 62, 72
Gregory Naz., 79

HADRIAN, 26, 46
Harmer (Lightfoot), 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 72, 84, 85, 88
Harnack, 11, 19, 20, 25, 31, 35
Haus, B., 9
Hefele, 9, 18, 75, 76, 89
Heresy, 20
Hilgenfeld, 12, 27, 46, 47, 48, 51
Hippolytus, 21, 35, 79, 89
Hoffmann, 73
Holy Ghost, 20, 41
Hort, Dr., 13
Hymns, 81, 82

IDOLATRY, 11, 22, 46, 54–56
Ignatius, 17
Imitation of God, 44, 78–80
Incarnation, 39–41, 45, 69–71
Inspiration, 42
Invisibility of Christian life, 43, 48, 49, 66
Irenæus, 21, 71

JEROME, 21, 83
Jews, 18, 65
John, S., 11, 15, 24, 49, 50, 79
John of Damascus, 12
Judaism, 12, 16, 22, 23, 33, 43, 47, 48, 57, 58, 61
Justin Martyr, 7, 12, 19, 20, 22, 44, 46, 64, 67, 72, 88

Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, 29
Kihn, 21, 25–27, 32, 46, 79
Krüger, 12, 27, 30

LACHMANN, 9, 55, 74, 76, 77, 78, 81, 83, 84, 89
Lactantius, 64
Law, imperial, 64; Jewish, 33, 83; natural, 69
Leyden, 9
Lightfoot, 19, 36, 37, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 72, 84, 85, 88
Logos, the, 23, 38, 41, 68, 69, 81
Lumper, 21

MARCION, 22, 23, 31
Martyrs, 43, 45, 71, 80

Maur, S., 8
Maursmünster, 8
Mysteries, Christian, 26
Mysticism, 42

NEUMANN, 9
Newness of Christianity, 16, 28, 52, 73, 82
New Testament, 11

OBERTHUR, 8
Old Testament, 11, 23, 35, 48
Origen, 20, 71
Ottley, 40
Otto, 9, 10, 35, 59, 68, 69, 77, 87
Overbeck, 11, 12, 27, 46, 48, 51

PAGANISM, 11, 22, 43, 46, 54–56, 61
Pantænus, 36
Paradise, 34, 44, 84, 85, 87
Passover, the Lord's, 88
Patripassianism, 39
Paul, S., 11, 25, 34, 41, 46, 55, 65, 73, 86
Pauli, Di, 35
Peregrinus Proteus, 13, 14
Persecution, 17, 65, 66, 68, 71
Pforzheim, 8
Philo, 12
Philosophy, Greek, 11, 44, 62, 72
Photius, 13, 14
Plato, 12, 67
Pliny, 17
Polycarp, 80
Preaching of Peter, 29, 30, 47, 53, 57, 60
Probst, 82
Prophecy, argument from, 11, 27, 28
Prophets, 33, 83
Prudentius of S. Maur, 8, 63, 81

QUADRATUS, 21
Questions of Diognetus, 34, 43, 45

RACE, the new, 52
Rabbinism, 62
Refutation of Heresies, 35
Religion, Supernatural, 15, 65
Reuchlin, 8
Reuss, 9
Revelation, 36, 42, 90
Ritual, Jewish, 16, 33
Robinson, Dr. Armitage, 30

SABBATH, 59, 60
Sabellianism, 72
Sacrifice, of Christ's death, 40; pagan, 46, 56; Jewish, 16, 33, 58
Seasons of Christian year, 82, 89
Social life of Christians, 48, 49, 63–65
Soul: Christians the soul of the world, 43, 50, 51, 66–68
Spirit, the Holy, 20, 41
Stars, 59, 60
Stephanus, 8, 10, 13, 15, 62, 71, 79, 81
Strassburg MS., v. *Argentoratensis*
Stromateis, 29
Subordinationism, 38
Supernatural Religion, 15, 65

Swete, Prof., 42
Sylburg, 8, 62, 71, 87, 89

TATIAN, 12, 31
Tertullian, 16, 17, 21, 24, 53, 64, 68
Testament, Old, 11, 23, 35; New, 11
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 74
Tillemont, 16, 22
Trajan, 17
Trees of Knowledge and Life, 85, 86
Trinity, Holy, 73, 74
Tübingen, 9, 32

ULHORN, 29

VIRGIN, the Blessed, 88

WESTCOTT, Bp., 21, 31, 34, 36, 37, 39, 42, 87, 90
Wisdom of Solomon, 55, 67
Word, the (personal), 38, 40, 68, 69, 81, 84, 89

QUOTATIONS FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE

	Epistle to Diognetus.
Genesis ii. 9.	12. 2, 3.
„ iii. 24.	12. 1.
Exod. xx. 11.	
Ps. cxlv. 6. (cp. Acts xiv. 15)	3. 4
John iii. 17.	7. 4, 5.
Rom. viii. 32.	9. 2.
1 Cor. iv. 12.	5. 15.
„ viii. 1.	12. 5
2 Cor. vi. 9, 10.	5. 12, 13, 16.
„ x. 3.	5. 8.
1 Pet. iii. 18.	9. 2.
1 John iv. 9.	10. 2.

Several other passages in the Epistle will be recognized as at least reminiscent of Holy Scripture: *e.g.* 3. 4 (Acts xvii. 25), 5. 9 (Phil. iii. 20), 6. 5 (Gal. v. 17), 7. 4 (Zech. ix. 9), 7. 6 (Mal. iii. 2), 9. 1, 2 (Rom. iii. 21–26, Titus iii. 3–5), 10. 3 (1 John iv. 19), 11. 4 (1 John i. 1, ii, 13, 14).

INDEX OF WORDS

barbarian, 63
common, 61, 64
deisidaimonia, 58
Demiurgus (Creator), 23, 38, 69
economy, 60, 74, 75
ἐποπτεία, 26
genos (*γένος*, *τρίτον*), 52, 53
gnorizo (*γνωρίζω*), 73
hypostasis (*ὑπόστασις*), 54
κάθαρσις, 26
καιρός, 75, 89
κηροί (Lat. *cereī*), 89
κήρυγμα Πέτρου, 29
κλῆροι, 89
κοινός, 61, 64
kosmos, 50
λόγος, 68, 87
μεγαλειότης, 79
μετακόσμια, 89
mysteries, 69, 73
νοῦς, 75
nursing-father, 77
οἰκονομία, 60, 74
οἰκονομικῶς, 74
ὅρια, 83
ὅρκια, 83
παιδαγωγία, 26
parousia, 71
πολιτεία, 50, 63
πολυπραγμοσύνη, 61, 62
στοιχεῖα, 70
συγχρωτίζεται, 87
συνετίζονται, 88
συνηθεία, 53
σωτήριον, 88
theosebeia, 59
τροφεύς, 79
Weltbewusstsein, 51

Richard Clay & Sons, Limited,
bread street hill, e.c., and
bungay, suffolk.

208.111
R 118
16023
RADFORD, L.B.
AUTHOR
Epistle to Diognetus
TITLE
DATE LOANED | BORROWER'S NAME | ROOM NUMBER
SEP 25
MAR 11
OCT 27
OCT 30
DEC 3
16023